

Please note, these transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

MEETING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

DIVERSION, PLANNING AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

JOE SERNA JR., CALEPA BUILDING

SIERRA HEARING ROOM

1001 I STREET, 2ND FLOOR

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2002

9:30 A.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR, RPR
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
LICENSE NUMBER 10063

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

APPEARANCES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Steven R. Jones, Chairperson

Jose Medina

Linda Moulton-Patterson

STAFF

Mark Leary, Executive Director

Julie Nauman, Chief Deputy Director

Pat Schiavo, Deputy Director

Eric Bissinger

Elliot Block, Staff Counsel

Rebecca Brown

Kathy Davis

Tara Gauthier

Maria Kakutani

Jerry Leiberman

Cara Morgan

Zane Poulson

Yasmin Satter

Chris Schmidle

Jill Simmons

Carolyn Sullivan

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

STAFF CONTINUED

Steve Uselton

Melissa Vargas

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

INDEX

	PAGE
Roll Call And Declaration Of Quorum	1
A. Deputy Director's Report	2
B. Consideration Of Allocation From The Used Oil Recycling Fund For FY 2002/2003 To Supplement The School DEEL Environmental Ambassador Pilot Program Grant Awards, And Consideration Of Grant Awards For The School DEEL Environmental Ambassador Pilot Program Grant -- (Budget And Administration Committee Item L And December Board Item 30)	5
Motion	12
Vote	12
C. Consideration Of The Amended Nondisposal Facility Element For The Unincorporated Area Of San Bernardino County -- (December Board Item 31)	12
Motion	13
Vote	14
D. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Carson, Los Angeles County -- (December Board Item 32)	14
Motion	20
Vote	20
E. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Cathedral City, Riverside County -- (December Board Item 33)	20
Motion	22
Vote	22
F. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element, For The City Of Oakland, Alameda County -- (December Board Item 34)	22
Motion	25
Vote	25

INDEX CONTINUED

PAGE

G. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Hesperia, San Bernardino County -- (December Board Item 35)	25
Motion	32
Vote	32
H. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The Town Of Apple Valley, San Bernardino County -- (December Board Item 1)	25
Motion	33
Vote	33
I. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Brea, Orange County -- (December Board Item 36)	34
Motion	36
Vote	36
J. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Buena Park, Orange County -- (December Board Item 37)	34
Motion	36
Vote	37
K. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Irvine, Orange County -- (December Board Item 38)	34
Motion	37
Vote	37
L. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Time Extension By The City Of Blythe, Riverside County -- (December Board Item 39)	38
Motion	39
Vote	39

INDEX CONTINUED

	PAGE
M. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Time Extension By The City Of Lemon Grove, San Diego County -- (December Board Item 40)	40
Motion	42
Vote	43
N. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Time Extension By The City Of Huntington Park, Los Angeles County -- (December Board Item 41)	43
Motion	45
Vote	45
O. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Time Extension By The City Of Adelanto, San Bernardino County -- (December Board Item 42)	45
Motion	46
Vote	47
P. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Time Extension By For The City Of Pleasant Hill, Contra Costa County -- (December Board Item 43)	47
Motion	49
Vote	49
Q. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Alternative Diversion Requirement By The City Of Clayton, Contra Costa County -- (December Board Item 44)	47
Motion	49
Vote	50
R. Consideration Of The Applications For A SB1066 Time Extension Or Alternative Diversion Requirement By The Cities Of Brawley, Calexico, Calipatria, Holtville, Imperial, And Westmorland, Imperial County -- (December Board Item 45)	50
Motion	53
Vote	53

INDEX CONTINUED

PAGE

S. Consideration Of A Petition For A Rural Reduction Of The Diversion Requirements And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Alturas, Modoc County -- (December Board Item 46)	54
Motion	56
Vote	57
T. Consideration Of A Petition For A Rural Reduction Request Of The Diversion Requirements And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The Unincorporated Area Of, Modoc County -- (December Board Item 47)	54
Motion	57
Vote	57
U. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element For The City of Pomona, Los Angeles County -- (December Board Item 48)	58
Motion	59
Vote	59
V. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 1999 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element, For The City of Torrance, Los Angeles County -- (December Board Item 49)	59
Motion	63
Vote	64
W. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element, And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element, For The City Of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County -- (December Board Item 50)	64
Motion	66
Vote	67

INDEX CONTINUED

PAGE

X. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element For The City Of Lafayette, Contra Costa County -- (December Board Item 51)	77
Motion	78
Vote	79
Y. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element For The Town Of Danville, Contra Costa County -- (December Board Item 52)	77
Motion	79
Vote	80
Z. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element For The City Of Walnut Creek, Contra Costa County -- (December Board Item 53)	77
Motion	79
Vote	79
AA. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 1998 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element, And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element, For The City Of Cupertino, Santa Clara County -- (December Board Item 54)	80
Motion	82
Vote	82
AB. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 1998 For the Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element; And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City of Beaumont, Riverside County -- (December Board Item 55)	82
Motion	84
Vote	85

INDEX CONTINUED

PAGE

AC. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element, And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The Unincorporated Area Of San Joaquin County -- (December Board Item 56)	86
Motion	88
Vote	88
AD. Consideration Of A Request To Correct The Base Year For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element For The City Of Brawley, Imperial County -- (December Board Item 57)	89
Motion	92
Vote	92
AE. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element; And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The County Of Ventura -- (December Board Item 58)	92
Motion	97
Vote	97
AF. Update On The Public Venues Waste Diversion Project -- (December Board Item 59)	98
Public Comment	102
Adjournment	102
Reporter's Certificate	103

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Good morning. And welcome to
3 the December 3rd meeting of the Diversion, Planning and
4 Local Assistance.

5 A couple of things we'd like you to do. If
6 you've got cell phones, shut them off or put them on
7 vibrate so we don't disrupt the meeting.

8 And if you want to speak on an item on the
9 agenda, there are speaker slips in the back of the room.
10 Go ahead and fill them out and hand them over to Jeannine
11 Bakulich over here and she will get them to us.

12 I think that's about it.

13 Would you call the roll, Jeannine.

14 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Medina?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Here.

16 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Moulton-Patterson?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Here.

18 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Jones?

19 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Here.

20 Mr. Eaton isn't on this Committee anymore. He
21 resigned from the Board. He's over in the building down
22 the street, at the dome. So he is working back in the
23 Legislature. So you get the three of us.

24 We've got a new member who got sworn in
25 yesterday, Carl Washington, that has just joined us. He

1 get here late yesterday. Julie was showing him around.

2 All right. Any comments or ex partes, members?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: None.

4 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Madam Chair?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: No. I'm up
6 to date.

7 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I'm up to date too. Said
8 hello to a few people, but no issues.

9 Mr. Schiavo.

10 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Good morning, Board
11 members. Pat Schiavo of the Diversion, Planning and Local
12 Assistance Division. And I want to give you a brief
13 update and highlight of some activities that are taking
14 place.

15 Regarding local jurisdictions' compliance with AB
16 939. After this month's meeting we'll have approximately
17 80 more jurisdictions to bring forward. We anticipate
18 that will be completed by February. Although in March
19 we'll have just a few additional ones, just the outliers
20 for the most part. So this process will be winding down
21 for this cycle of the biennial reviews.

22 Regarding the AB 75 program, which is the reviews
23 of the state agencies, total annual reports submitted to
24 date by the state agencies is about 400. There are still
25 about 10 that have not submitted the report. So we're

1 going to continue to impress upon them the importance of
2 getting the reports in.

3 The Executive Director has approved a little bit
4 more than 260 of the reviews. There's another 54 coming
5 forward to you soon. And there's about 50 more that staff
6 are reviewing. We anticipate the process for reviews of
7 the AB 75 program will be completed by December of this
8 year. So that's moving along real well.

9 The electronic annual report that we will use for
10 the 2002 annual reports for the state agencies will be
11 completed and operational by the end of January. So again
12 that component is going very well, so we're very pleased
13 with that.

14 We have a few workshops I'd like to announce. On
15 December 6th we're going to have a workshop at the Los
16 Angeles County Sanitation District regarding state
17 agencies. And we also have another meeting December 9th
18 in Sacramento. And again it's to just walk through state
19 agencies, the program processes, take care of -- you know,
20 there's new people that have cycled into the program, new
21 representatives from the state agencies. So we'll get
22 them up to speed on the program and the requirements.

23 On December 5th in Sacramento and December 12th
24 in Diamond Bar we will be conducting the first draft
25 workshops for the disposal reporting regulations. So,

1 again, that will commence this week in Sacramento and next
2 week in Diamond Bar. And that will begin our process for
3 the disposal reporting regulatory process. So stay tuned.

4 And, finally, some good news on the Board of
5 Equalization front. We have finally got release of the
6 numbers from Board of Equalization regarding taxable
7 sales. So staff is currently going through the process of
8 reconciliation and comparing numbers and testing the
9 numbers. And we'll be getting a notice out to
10 jurisdictions. We're looking at having jurisdictions
11 submit their annual reports to us probably around the
12 beginning of February, because it will take us a couple of
13 weeks to test. So we anticipate we'll have it up on our
14 website the middle of this month, December 13th or so.
15 And then we're going to give jurisdictions an additional
16 couple of weeks because of the holiday season. We want to
17 be reasonable in that regard.

18 CHAIRPERSON JONES: How long were you held up on
19 that?

20 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: What, 6, 8 months.
21 Quite awhile.

22 So that concludes my presentation.

23 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Questions, members?

24 All right. Mr. Schiavo.

25 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. We'll start out

1 with Agenda Item -- or Committee Item B, Agenda Item
2 Number 30 in the agenda packet for the entire Board
3 meeting. And this is consideration of allocation from the
4 Used Oil Recycling Fund for Fiscal Year 2002-2003 to
5 supplement the School DEEL Environmental Ambassador Pilot
6 Program grant awards and consideration of grant awards for
7 the School DEEL Environmental Ambassador Pilot Program
8 grant.

9 And I will be making this presentation. And then
10 we'll be having a short presentation by our consultant.

11 The Board approved the School DEEL implementation
12 plan at its September 17th Board meeting. And part of
13 that plan was implementation of the Environmental
14 Ambassador Program grant awards. These grant awards will
15 provide funding for districts that have shown exemplary
16 environmental education or resource conservation programs
17 or both. And these programs are to serve as models for
18 other districts to emulate in the future.

19 With input from the Department of Education there
20 were initially 25 schools that were selected as potential
21 candidates. And through extensive interview processes and
22 analysis, this got reduced down to 9 potential candidates.
23 One of those potential candidates dropped out of the
24 process, and that left us with 8. And, again, based on an
25 extensive review process with staff from throughout,

1 representing different offices and divisions throughout
2 the Board, as well as our representative from the Consumer
3 Services Agency, it was felt that all 8 deserved funding
4 at some level.

5 One of the districts out of these 8 would
6 actually be funded by the state and Consumer Services
7 Agency. So the Board will be funding 7; Consumer Services
8 Agency, the 8th one.

9 Staff felt that these districts represent a very
10 wide diverse group geographically as well as -- urban
11 versus rural as well as social and economic well being.

12 Additionally, these school districts have
13 committed in writing that they will perform in this
14 program at a two-year capacity. And, again, that was very
15 important to us to have that commitment and to have it in
16 writing as part of the process, because we don't want to
17 start this program and have people dropping out halfway
18 through it.

19 That concludes my presentation.

20 Now, Jerry Leiberman from the Sierra Group will
21 make a short presentation, and then we'll ask for a vote.

22 Thank you.

23 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
24 Presented as follows.)

25 MR. LEIBERMAN: Good morning.

1 Give you a little more in-depth background on
2 these districts that have been selected and the one County
3 Office of Education. This is a critically important
4 program.

5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Is your button on?

6 MR. LEIBERMAN: No, no. Got it.

7 This is a critically important program that the
8 Board is taking a revolutionary lead on in terms of
9 bringing education related to waste diversion, energy,
10 water conservation, and other resources into the school
11 systems around the state.

12 --o0o--

13 MR. LEIBERMAN: We went through an intensive
14 process over a several month period of identifying
15 districts, schools, County Offices of Ed that were
16 potential candidates for this program. They were
17 requested to submit background information. They were
18 scored by teams from the Waste Board's Office of
19 Integrated Environmental Education. And then we conducted
20 site visits to those school districts to determine if in
21 fact they were committed to continuing and deeply
22 involving themselves in this integrated environmental
23 education program.

24 We currently have 8 candidates that are being
25 proposed to the Board for selection and funding.

1 --o0o--

2 MR. LEIBERMAN: They include Burbank Unified
3 School District; Desert Sands Unified School District;
4 fresno Unified; Humboldt County Office of Education, which
5 will involve 8 different schools and 5 different school
6 districts within the county; los Angeles Unified, which
7 represents one of the subdistricts, Subdistrict B, which
8 is the valley; Oak Grove Union School District; San Juan
9 Unified School District; and Warner Union School district.

10 --o0o--

11 MR. LEIBERMAN: Their distribution crosses the
12 state. We wanted to assure that per the SB 373
13 legislation that there was a broad geographic and
14 demographic distribution. You can see we go from far
15 southern California almost to the northern border here.

16 --o0o--

17 MR. LEIBERMAN: Likewise, the legislation
18 required a demographic representation. You can see at the
19 bottom the state averages and the Environmental Ambassador
20 Pilot Program averages. So regarding economics, that's
21 measured generally in school systems by free and reduced
22 meals. And a fairly balanced distribution across the
23 districts of racial and ethnic groups, really per the
24 distribution on state averages as well.

25 You can see interestingly, and this was something

1 we strove to accomplish, we have a diversity in terms of
2 the sizes of the districts. We go from two very small
3 districts, Oak Grove in Sonoma County and Warner in San
4 Diego County, up to in fact two very large districts,
5 Fresno and Los Angeles.

6 --o0o--

7 MR. LEIBERMAN: The grant funds under these
8 programs will be used in cooperation with the Office of
9 Integrated Environmental Education and the external
10 consultants to provide professional development for
11 additional teachers. In other words what we were looking
12 for here was the opportunity to expand from a small number
13 of schools in some of these districts to a larger number
14 of schools in these districts by bringing this opportunity
15 to additional teachers, classrooms, and schools in the
16 districts.

17 These schools have committed to conducting waste
18 energy and water audits. The district and school
19 personnel importantly have committed to working with us to
20 develop standards-based integrated curricular programs
21 that will be used as models in other schools in other
22 districts across the state. And that's critically
23 important that the partnership exists with the State Board
24 of Education and the California Department of Education
25 and the Governor's Secretary of Education. That is making

1 this all a possibility.

2 We will seek to work with them so that their
3 curricular structures include service learning
4 opportunities at the elementary, middle, and high school
5 programs.

6 And ultimately what we're trying to do is work
7 with them so that they have demonstrations of sustainable
8 models of integrated education programs that connect what
9 they're doing in their diversion, recycling, and other
10 conservation efforts into their standards-based
11 objectives.

12 --o0o--

13 MR. LEIBERMAN: Ultimately these schools and
14 districts will be developing site-based management plans
15 so that they can expand the efforts that are ongoing.

16 You'll see in that diversity of districts that we
17 brought to you an incredible array of successes to date.
18 If we look, for example, at Desert Sands Unified School
19 District down in southern California, you have a district
20 which has a fully funded recycling coordinator. The
21 funding for that recycling coordinator in fact already
22 comes from the savings at the district level. They're
23 about to higher an energy coordinator on a full-time
24 basis. So they're truly an incredible demonstration
25 project for you of what successes that school districts

1 can achieve.

2 Any questions?

3 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Are there any questions?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Not regarding the
5 presentation itself. But I know that one candidate
6 dropped out. Was that candidate replaced or were the
7 monies rolled over? What happened in that case?

8 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: No, we had actually 9
9 candidates we -- they dropped out at the last moment. And
10 these were the most viable candidates based on the
11 interviews that took place and other reviews.

12 So, no, they weren't replaced.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: And so the money is
14 rolled over, or what happens to it?

15 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: No, no. There is just
16 enough money actually funded for the remaining 8
17 candidates -- or actually 7, and then there's the
18 additional that will be funded by State Consumer Services.
19 So the money was based on those 7 candidates.

20 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Madam Chair.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,
22 Chairman Jones.

23 I would just like to thank Pat and his staff and
24 Trish and her staff.

25 And, Mr. Leiberman, you've done a great job

1 bringing this together. And it's really exciting to me to
2 see our environmental education program going forth. So
3 thank you. I know it's been many, many meetings.

4 And I'd like to move Resolution 2002-770 for at
5 least to put on consent if we get a majority vote.

6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

8 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by
9 Chairman Moulton-Patterson. We've got a second by Mr.
10 Medina.

11 Call the roll please.

12 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Medina?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.

14 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Moulton-Patterson?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.

16 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Jones?

17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Aye.

18 Put this on fiscal consensus. I know it has to
19 go to Mr. Medina's Admin Committee.

20 All right. Item C, which is 31 in your program.

21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: This is consideration
22 of the amended Nondisposal Facility Element for the
23 unincorporated area of San Bernardino County.

24 And Rebecca Brown will make this presentation.

25 MS. BROWN: Good morning, Mr Chairman and

1 Committee members.

2 The County of San Bernardino has amended their
3 Nondisposal Facility Element, NDFE, by identifying and
4 describing the material recovery facility at the 29 Palms
5 Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center, a new facility.

6 The MERF will be sited near the military base
7 landfill, also in the unincorporated are of the county.

8 The Board's Permits and Enforcement Division will
9 be presenting an agenda item for the proposed permit for
10 this facility in the future.

11 This is the fourth amendment to the county's
12 originally approved NDFE. The county has submitted all
13 their documentation. And Board staff therefore recommends
14 approval of this amendment to the county's NDFE.

15 This conclude my presentation. Are there any
16 questions?

17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?

18 Mr. Medina.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.

20 I'd like to move this Resolution 2002-705, a
21 consideration of the amended Nondisposal Facility Element
22 for the unincorporated area of San Bernardino County.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

24 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion by Mr. Medina, a
25 second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

1 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Substitute the previous roll?

2 On consent?

3 Thank you, members.

4 Next item.

5 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item D, Board Item 32,
6 is consideration of the 1999-2002 biennial review findings
7 for the Source Reduction and Recycling Element and
8 Household Hazardous Waste Element for the city of Carson,
9 Los Angeles County.

10 And Steve Uselton will present.

11 MR. USELTON: Good morning, Committee members.

12 This item presents to the Committee for its
13 consideration Board staff's biennial review findings for
14 the city of Carson.

15 Staff has conducted their biennial review of the
16 city of Carson and found that the city has achieved a 2000
17 diversion rate above 50 percent and is adequately
18 implementing source reduction, recycling, composting and
19 public education and information programs as outlined in
20 their Source Reduction and Recycling Element and Household
21 Hazardous Waste Elements.

22 This city did not implement a curbside green
23 waste collection program as identified in the city's
24 Source Reduction and Recycling Element. However, the city
25 has provided documentation showing that it had contracted

1 services for this program, but the contract was rescinded
2 after legal matters pertaining to its approval by the city
3 council were identified.

4 City staff have provided a letter to Board staff
5 indicating that the city's intent is to provide this
6 program through a new RFP to contract for residential
7 services that will include the addition of curbside green
8 waste collection.

9 Board staff recommend that this program should be
10 implemented, but can also support a recommendation that
11 the jurisdiction has achieved 50 percent diversion rate
12 and is adequately implementing the programs outlined in
13 their Source Reduction and Recycling Element.

14 Staff is recommending approval of the city's
15 1999-2000 biennial review. Should the Board not accept
16 staff's recommendations, jurisdiction did not reserve the
17 right in their 2000 annual report to submit an SB 1066
18 time extension.

19 This concludes my presentation.

20 Both Board staff and representatives for the
21 jurisdiction are available to answer any questions.

22 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?

23 I just have one. Carson -- when this -- this was
24 one of our biggest base years that came forward to us a
25 couple years ago. And it was pretty tough to -- I mean I

1 bought it completely. But we're going to have to have
2 further discussions about these. This is at 72 percent.
3 There's no green waste collection program. There's no
4 curbside program. There is an ingenious method of
5 extrapolation that we ended up stopping after a while.

6 It's not fair to the city. We had adopted this.
7 I'm not going to go back on that. But I'm going tell you,
8 we've got to get into this and really look at these
9 programs and figure out what the number is, because -- the
10 number, it's accurate. It's 72 percent based on that base
11 year. But knowing what we know today, it doesn't make
12 sense, not with the programs that aren't implemented, to
13 have that kind of diversion. That makes this whole law a
14 sham.

15 So I mean it will -- I think we have to honor
16 what we did originally. But that doesn't mean we don't go
17 back in and really audit and figure out what's going on
18 here.

19 And it's not just Carson. There's other cities
20 that are in the same boat. But 72 percent without these
21 programs tells you how good extrapolation can be. There's
22 too much money being spent by cities to do programs. We
23 need to deal with this. That would be my opinion.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I just had
25 one question.

1 Who is here from Carson? I mean I hate to bring
2 this up. But I just, you know, wanted assurances with
3 some of the problems in the news lately that the
4 commitment to this is still there.

5 MS. GALLANT: Good morning. My name is Ann Marie
6 Gallant. I'm the General Manager.

7 I did come this morning with my staff because I
8 anticipated that there would be some questions. And since
9 your Board staff had prepared the report, other things
10 have appeared in the news.

11 It is true, we've had several arrests. We have
12 an election in March of 2003. We will have a minimum of
13 two seats available, possibly three.

14 We had anticipated going forward this past spring
15 and summer with a revised RFP after the city council
16 elected to invalidate the two contract agreements. One,
17 which was with Waste Management, would have addressed all
18 of the residential recycling.

19 And you are totally correct, the city does not
20 have any residential recycling of a large substantive
21 nature to speak of. But I think too we need to remember
22 that of its 20-some square miles, 68 percent of it is
23 commercial industrial land use. And we're going through a
24 general plan amendment, and that will be increased.

25 It's an unusual kind of city. We certainly

1 welcome any additional reevaluation that we need to go
2 through.

3 We have inner agreements which are legal and
4 valid. The RFP process will culminate sometime in the
5 spring. We want to do that, and are recommending that
6 from a staff perspective so that we have a new council
7 seated who can vote on this action. This is a major
8 contract in any city, and we'd expect a new complete
9 council seated to take any kind of policy action with
10 respect to that.

11 The staff has worked very hard. I've been with
12 them just two years and have lived this process from the
13 beginning when we started the investigation. It's not
14 been easy on an organization to take this kind of public
15 perception. But we're working very hard at that. The
16 city's committed a lot to this program over the years, and
17 we are committed to meet whatever objectives you have.
18 But we would welcome any changes that you want to
19 evaluate. We just need a little bit of time to regroup
20 here, and implement it come the -- we anticipate July 1st
21 as the new contract.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you
23 for being here.

24 MS. GALLANT: No problem. Thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah, I appreciate it too.

1 And I want you to know that -- you know, we looked at the
2 paperwork. We agreed -- I had a member who's not here
3 anymore that said, "Are you sure?" And I said, "You know
4 what. I've gone over it and I can't find a reason not to
5 vote for it."

6 But we had to stop the process because there were
7 a lot of cities that came forward. That's why we had the
8 moratorium, because it -- you know, math is always fun to
9 play with.

10 We don't think it's fair to pile on. And that's
11 not what I was talking about. It will be some time. But
12 I think it's fair to the city and I think it's fair to all
13 the other cities that we take a look at that down the road
14 and see what kind of a base year is more representative of
15 what's going on. That'll let you spend your dollars more
16 wisely.

17 MS. GALLANT: More wisely.

18 No, we appreciate the comment. I think it is a
19 valid one. We'd just like to have an opportunity to get
20 into it. And I think that once we implement the
21 residential recycling full base, we'll have a better
22 number of statistics on them.

23 Thank you very much.

24 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you very much.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Yes, the statements

1 made by Chair Jones actually reflect the feelings of the
2 Board and the concerns in regard to the city of Carson.
3 Our staff has monitored this situation very closely and
4 they have recommended approval. And so on that basis I
5 want to move forward and move Resolution 2002-706 --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'll second.

7

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: -- consideration of the
9 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the Source
10 Reduction and Recycling Element and Household Hazardous
11 Waste Element for the city of Carson, los Angeles County.

12 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Mr.
13 Medina, a second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

14 Substitute the previous roll?

15 On consent?

16 Thank you, members.

17 Next Item Number 33.

18 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. Item E in the
19 planning packet is consideration of the 1999-2000 biennial
20 review findings for the city of Cathedral City, Riverside
21 County.

22 And Melissa Vargas will make this presentation.

23 MS. VARGAS: Good morning, Committee members.

24 The city of Cathedral City originally submitted a
25 2000 generation study request with a diversion rate of 50

1 percent. As part of the generation study review, Board
2 staff conducted a detailed site visit for the city. Board
3 staff-recommended changes can be seen in Attachment 3 of
4 the agenda item packet.

5 With Board staff-recommended changes the city's
6 diversion rate is 49 percent for the proposed 2000
7 generation study.

8 The city is also claiming biomass for the Year
9 2000, which will add one percent to the diversion rate,
10 giving them a new diversion rate of 50 percent for the
11 Year 2000.

12 Board staff also conducted a review of the city's
13 diversion programs. The city has reported that they have
14 successfully implemented source reduction, recycling,
15 composting, and public education programs in order to meet
16 the 50 percent diversion goal.

17 Based on this information Board staff is
18 recommending Option 1 of the agenda item, which would
19 approve the city's 2000 generation study with staff
20 recommendations and the city's biomass claim and accept
21 the 1999-2000 biennial review findings.

22 A representative from the city is available to
23 answer any questions.

24 This concludes my presentation.

25 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?

1 Mr. Medina.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.

3 I'd like to move Resolution 2002-707,
4 consideration of the '99-2000 biennial review findings for
5 the Source Reduction and Recycling Element and Household
6 Hazardous Waste Element for the city of Cathedral City,
7 Riverside County.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

9 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Mr.
10 Medina, a second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

11 Substitute the previous roll?

12 On consent?

13 Congratulations, Cathedral City.

14 Next item.

15 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item F, in the Board
16 packet it's Item 34. This is consideration of the
17 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the city of
18 Oakland, Alameda County.

19 And Carolyn Sullivan will present.

20 MS. SULLIVAN: Good morning. Staff conducted a
21 1999-2000 biennial review for the city of Oakland and
22 found the city has adequately implemented solid waste
23 diversion programs.

24 In addition, staff found that the city has
25 achieved a 2000 diversion rate of at least 50 percent,

1 with no more than 10 percent diversion coming from biomass
2 diversion credit.

3 As described in the item, the jurisdiction's 2000
4 diversion rate would change from 49 percent to 52 percent
5 with the biomass diversion credit.

6 In addition, staff conducted a program review in
7 2002 and verified that the jurisdiction's diversion
8 program implementation is solid in its foundation and
9 effectiveness, which is the basis for staff's
10 recommendation.

11 Board staff recommend Option 1 of this agenda
12 item, which would approve the biennial review findings for
13 the city as well as it's biomass claim.

14 A representative from the city is present to
15 answer any questions.

16 This concludes my presentation.

17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We do have one speaker slip,
18 Susan Kattchee.

19 I do want to just say that the curbside green
20 waste in '97 where you guys did an information -- you
21 know, really did a campaign to cut down contamination and
22 get more participation, I wish that was followed in more
23 jurisdictions. It is important that you can see a 25
24 percent increase due to that. I know some do it. But
25 some don't.

1 Go ahead.

2 MS. KATTCHEE: Good morning, Board members.

3 Susan Kattchee with the city of Oakland.

4 Thank you for that comment. It just goes to show
5 that you have to continue to promote your programs to
6 continue to get the participation and the diversion that
7 you're looking for.

8 I just wanted to take this opportunity to thank
9 the staff of the Local Assistance Branch for their
10 assistance over the years, helping us interpret the
11 changing regulations and the complexity of those
12 regulations.

13 We believe that the numbers for the city of
14 Oakland speak for themselves, not only that we were
15 committed in the spirit of the law, but also, through our
16 actions, implementation of waste reduction programs.

17 To this end the city council of Oakland in
18 October adopted a 75-percent waste reduction goal by 2010,
19 in alliance with the Alameda County goal of 75 percent. I
20 would say we've set up quite a challenge for ourselves
21 here in the next 8 years. So we will be continuing to
22 look to you for support in meeting our -- implementing new
23 programs to meet that goal to conserve resources and
24 reduce waste.

25 So thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you. Congratulations
2 to your city council and your mayor. I know your mayor is
3 committed to the number. I've heard it.

4 Any questions, members?

5 Mr. Medina.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.

7 Before moving this resolution I also want to
8 commend the city of Oakland for a number of their
9 outstanding programs. They have a large number of
10 programs, and they're doing an exceptional job on those
11 programs.

12 With that I'd like to move Resolution 2002-708,
13 consideration of the '99-2000 biennial review findings for
14 the Source Reduction and Recycling Element and Household
15 Hazardous Waste Element for the city of Oakland, Alameda
16 County.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

18 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We have a motion by Mr.
19 Medina, a second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

20 Substitute the previous roll?

21 On consent?

22 Thank you, members.

23 Next item, number G.

24 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. This will be eye
25 Items G and H. And these will be consideration of the

1 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the cities of
2 Hesperia and Apple Valley in San Bernardino County.

3 And Rebecca Brown will make the presentations.

4 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thirty-five thirty -- no --
5 and thirty-seven.

6 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Oh, it's in different
7 order then?

8 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Or wait.

9 Okay. One. I'm sorry.

10 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item 1.

11 MS. BROWN: Okay. The City of Hesperia's
12 diversion rate for both 1999 and 2000 is 47 percent. To
13 determine the level of program implementation, staff
14 analyzed the historic diversion rate trend, which has been
15 increasing, and conducted a program verification site
16 visit in 2001.

17 Some of the major programs that have been
18 implemented include source-separated curbside collection
19 of green waste, solid waste processing at the materials
20 recovery facility, school recycling and diversion of
21 construction and demolition debris.

22 Staff recommends the Board finds that Hesperia
23 has made a good faith effort in meeting diversion
24 requirements. And a representative of Hesperia is present
25 to answer your questions.

1 The Town of Apple Valley is a continuation item
2 from the October 15th-16th Board meeting.

3 The town requested approval based on good faith
4 efforts. However, board staff recommended that the town
5 of Apple Valley submit an SB 1066 time-extension
6 application.

7 The town requested that the agenda item be
8 continued to a later meeting as the hauler was submitting
9 additional information for consideration.

10 On November 5th, 2002, Board staff met with
11 representatives from the town and with the hauler. The
12 history of the development of Apple Valley's programs was
13 presented, including program development implementation
14 and results through 2001.

15 Board staff reviewed the information submitted by
16 the hauler and confirmed that the
17 residential/non-residential percentages have not changed.
18 Based upon the site visit staff concurs that the town has
19 made significant program enhancements. However, due to
20 the continued need for program enhancements and increase
21 in disposal tonnage in 2001, staff is recommending the
22 town submit a time-extension request within the next 30
23 days.

24 There is not a representative present from the
25 town.

1 This concludes my presentation for both
2 jurisdictions. Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. We have one speaker
4 slip on the second item. Diana McKeen -- Diane McKeen.

5 MS. McKEEN: I want to thank the Committee for
6 allowing staff to have additional time to come down and
7 meet with Apple Valley, which they did. Seems to be -- I
8 apologize for appearing in this condition. No one should
9 fly when their ears are plugged. The last time I was here
10 I had the MERF administrator and JPA administrator, John
11 Davis; and a Burrtec representative, Eric Herpert, here.
12 They're both sick. Eric says it's my fault.

13 I repudiate that suggestion. How could he
14 possibly have my cold when I still have it.

15 So anyway, thank you.

16 We had -- Pat Schiavo, Cara Morgan, and Rebecca
17 Brown came down and visited with us in last month. I know
18 they took in what we said because of the difference
19 between the two agenda items. The October agenda item had
20 about six or seven bulleted suggestions. And when they
21 came down, we said, Look, you know, been there, done that,
22 doing that, tried that." And this staff report comes back
23 saying, yes, there have been significant enhancements.
24 They didn't note any specific deficiencies, but say
25 there's gaps in the program.

1 All programs can to be improved. That's
2 certainly the town's goal and my personal responsibility.

3 The emphasis on the 2001 figures, which at this
4 point for me are unverified, it's raw data, kind of
5 bothers me. I believe we did not as well on diversion in
6 2001 as we are doing in 2002, but I still don't see what
7 either of those has to do with my biennial review. It
8 should be 1999 and 2000, which need to stand on their own.

9 And each jurisdiction is unique. I'm not first
10 person to stand here and say, "But we're different."
11 That's the whole point of 20-22, is to allow the Board
12 flexibility where the jurisdiction has obviously put forth
13 the effort and not seen the results they would have
14 anticipated in numbers. We have just straight numbers
15 that are reported to us. We have no -- have done no
16 ingenious extrapolation. We haven't done any fancy work
17 with the base year, and we're a relatively young city.
18 We'd been incorporated one year when -- or less than a
19 year when AB 939 passed.

20 If it's the Board's determination that we file a
21 request for extension, we will certainly comply. I'm at a
22 loss to know specifically what we can put in there since
23 no deficiencies were noted. We're either in good faith or
24 we're not. If you determine that we need to fill out --
25 complete an extension -- request for extension of time,

1 you're finding us not in good faith. And that means that
2 the millions of dollars that have been put in to build and
3 operate the MERF to do all the programs, which take up a
4 little more than a page in the agenda item -- the staff
5 was really good about reporting what we are doing -- we're
6 saying we're not on target, that we're not doing a -- that
7 I am not doing a good enough with these things.

8 So I'm open to Board suggestions and appreciate
9 all your help. And thank you for your consideration.

10 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions?

11 The number is not what is as important to -- the
12 number's an indicator of how the programs are doing. And
13 I think that when this -- when we gave the continuance, it
14 was because there was a problem with relating some of the
15 numbers, and some of the information didn't come quite
16 like it needed to. And put our staff in a tough position.
17 So we granted that month to get that figured out.

18 But I think one of the things that we've got --
19 that I've got to always think about as one member of this
20 Board is that I never rely just on the number, but I do
21 rely on the effort. And the fact that there are a lot of
22 programs in place is one thing. How those programs are
23 being, you know, really moved and getting people to buy
24 into the participation is always the piece that, you know,
25 is subject to what's enough.

1 We in the past have put cities on compliance that
2 were over 50 percent because they didn't do the amount of
3 work that they needed to. And so that number really
4 wasn't an indicator of the effort that went in.

5 I think you guys are probably pretty close. I
6 had a MERF operator that said, "We built the MERF" -- they
7 were like 20 percent or something, 18 percent, when we did
8 the first go around. And said, "You shouldn't put us on
9 compliance because we built the MERF." And I said, "We
10 should put you on compliance because nobody's using the
11 MERF."

12 And in fact we did put them on compliance. They
13 focused their efforts. And when they came back, they were
14 up over 52 percent. And All of a sudden their tonnages
15 went up through the roof because people -- there was a
16 commitment to get off a compliance.

17 I think with Apple Valley we're not saying that
18 you're not doing your job. We're saying -- which is why
19 the bill was written, 1066 -- that we're going to give you
20 a little more time to really focus on trying to improve
21 those programs. Not the fact that they're there, but to
22 get more people to participate and do whatever you have to
23 in that timeframe. And that would be, you know, what I
24 would be advocating. Because I think that the efforts
25 there, but maybe we need to have a little more focused

1 effort and try to get it up. Because, remember, this bill
2 gets -- the 50 percent gets looked at every two years.

3 With 1066 it's a voluntarily process that you're
4 able to pretty much dictate how you think you're going to
5 be able to get there through a plan that we would end up
6 approving.

7 If in 2002 -- the biennial reviews from 2002 show
8 that there's been no change and you're still at 43
9 percent, this Board could say, "Put Apple Valley on a
10 compliance order." Ten sixty-six goes out the window.

11 So I think that my thought would be 1066 is a
12 much friendlier way to get the job done. And I think that
13 it'll help let Eric and everybody else focus on those
14 programs that will get you where you need to be.

15 So that would be my suggestion.

16 All right. Members, any questions?

17 Mr. Medina.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.

19 I'd like to move Resolution 2002-709,
20 consideration of the '99-2000 biennial review findings for
21 the Source Reduction and Recycling Element and Household
22 Hazardous Waste Element for the city Hesperia, San
23 Bernardino County.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

25 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Mr.

1 Medina, a second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

2 Substitute the previous roll?

3 On consent?

4 Thank you, members.

5 Mr. Medina.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: In regard to Apple
7 Valley, I'm going to go for Option 2, which is recommended
8 by staff, that the Board approve the staff's '99-2000
9 biennial review findings and allow the town to submit a
10 1066 time extension application within 30 days and approve
11 the town's HHWE.

12 Now, is that consistent with moving the
13 resolution?

14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Yes.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Very well. Then I'll
16 move Resolution 2002-538, consideration of the '99-2000
17 biennial review findings for the Source Reduction and
18 Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element
19 for the town of Apple Valley, San Bernardino County.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We have a motion by Mr.
22 Medina, a second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

23 Substitute the previous roll?

24 On consent?

25 Thank you, members.

1 Next.

2 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: We'll combine Committee
3 Items I, J, and K. And these are Board Items 36, 37, and
4 38. And these are consideration of the 1999-2000 biennial
5 review findings for the Source Reduction and Recycling
6 Element for the cities of Brea, Buena Park, and Irvine,
7 all in Orange County.

8 And Maria Kakutani will make these presentations.

9 MS. KAKUTANI: Good morning, Committee members.

10 Staff conducted the 1999-2000 biennial review for
11 the cities of Buena Park, Irvine, and Brea.

12 Buena Park's diversion rate for 1999 is 44
13 percent and for 2000 is 52 percent. Irvine's diversion
14 rate for 1999 is 37 percent and for 2000 is 50 percent.
15 Brea's diversion rate for 1999 is 32 percent and for 2000
16 is 50 percent.

17 Staff has conducted a program verification site
18 visit for Buena Park in 2000 and Irvine in 1999 and Brea
19 in 2001.

20 Staff analyzed the historic diversion rate trend
21 for Buena Park, Irvine, which has been trending upward
22 near 50 percent in the last five years.

23 Diversion rate for Brea has also -- was also
24 trending upward near 50 percent until 1997, when tonnage
25 reporting problems resulted in incorrect origin of waste

1 started to occur in the Brea-Olinda Landfill. And later
2 in the meeting the city will share their efforts to
3 address the dislocated waste.

4 Some of the major programs that have been
5 implemented include a materials recovery facilities for
6 commercial and residential streams, extensive commercial
7 on-site collections, residential green waste collection,
8 and various public education and outreach programs.

9 Based on the Board-adopted process of January
10 2002 that would allow a jurisdiction to claim a deduction
11 in disposal tonnage for C&D waste generated within its
12 boundaries, staff has deducted 14,993 tons from Buena
13 Park, which increases the diversion rate from 43 to 52
14 percent; 23,655 from Irvine, which increases the diversion
15 rate from 48 to 50 percent; and 7,743 tons of C&D waste
16 and 21,080 of self-haul tonnage adjustment from Brea,
17 which increases the diversion rate from 39 percent to 50
18 percent.

19 Staff has determined that the city of Buena Park
20 Irvine, and Brea have met their program implementation and
21 diversion requirements.

22 Representatives from the cities are present to
23 answer any questions.

24 This concludes my presentation.

25 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?

1 I know Brea -- I was at a meeting down there
2 where they had so much self-haul waste going in that had
3 been attached to the city of Brea. There was roofing
4 material. They could have roofed half the town in one
5 year. So for you guys to end up meeting your goal and
6 doing the program says a lot for you because you do have
7 some unique issues as a host city for a landfill that is
8 in that sort of a jigsaw area of people coming in.

9 Mr. Medina.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.

11 I'd like to move Resolution 2002-711,
12 consideration of the '99-2000 biennial review findings for
13 the Source Reduction and Recycling Element and Household
14 Hazardous Waste Element for the city of Brea, Orange
15 County.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Mr.
18 Medina, a second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

19 Substitute the previous roll?

20 On consent?

21 Thank you, members.

22 Mr. Medina.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: With that I'd like to
24 move Resolution 2002-712, consideration of the '99-2000
25 biennial review findings for the Source Reduction and

1 Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element
2 for the city of Buena Park, Orange County.

3 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Mr.
4 Medina.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: A second by Chair
7 Moulton-Patterson.

8 Substitute the previous roll?

9 On consent?

10 Thank you, members.

11 Mr. Medina.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move
13 Resolution 2002-713, consideration of the '99-2000
14 biennial review findings for the Source Reduction and
15 Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element
16 for the City of Irvine, Orange County.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

18 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Mr.
19 Medina, a second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

20 Substitute the previous roll?

21 On consent?

22 Thank you, members.

23 You know, one of those jurisdictions had a five
24 pound per person per day, I think. You got to do some
25 work with that number.

1 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Definitely some
2 allocation issues.

3 Item L, and Board Item 39, is consideration of
4 the application for an SB 1066 time extension by the city
5 of Blythe in Riverside County.

6 And Melissa Vargas is going to make this
7 presentation.

8 MS. VARGAS: Good morning, Chairman Jones and
9 Committee members.

10 The city of Blythe is requesting a time extension
11 in order to complete diversion program development to meet
12 AB 939 goals. The specific reasons the city needs a time
13 extension are as follows: To increase participation in
14 new and expanded curbside participation residential
15 recycling and green waste programs; to increase
16 participation in newly expanded commercial on-site pickup
17 of recycling and green waste; to establish new E-waste
18 collection programs; to complete development of public
19 education and business outreach; to increase participation
20 in C&D programs that includes development of a new C&D
21 ordinance.

22 The city of Blythe has agreed to a change in the
23 date of completion for their time extension from June
24 30th, 2004, to December 31st, 2004, as specified in the
25 resolution attached with the agenda item.

1 Staff has also identified programs in the
2 resolution that were included in the city's application,
3 but not specified in the plan of correction. The city
4 anticipates a 15 percent increase.

5 Board staff has determined that the information
6 submitted in the application is adequately documented and
7 is recommending that the Board approve the city's time
8 extension request.

9 This concludes my presentation.

10 Representatives for the city are available to
11 answer your questions.

12 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Members, any questions?

13 Mr. Medina.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.

15 I'd like to move Resolution 2002-715,
16 consideration of the application for SB 1066 time
17 extension by the city of Blythe, Riverside County, and
18 going with Option 3 recommended by the staff.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

20 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Mr.
21 Medina, a second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

22 Substitute the previous roll?

23 On consent?

24 Thank you, members.

25 Item M, number 40.

1 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Yeah, this is
2 consideration of the application for an SB 1066 time
3 extension by the city of Lemon Grove, San Diego County.

4 And Yasmin Satter will make this presentation.

5 MS. SATTER: Good morning, Chairman Jones and
6 Committee members.

7 The city of Lemon Grove has requested a time
8 extension through December 31st, 2003. Specific reasons
9 the city needs a time extension are as follows: Expand
10 the programs identified in the plan of correction,
11 specifically residential curbside and C&D recycling
12 programs; expand public and commercial outreach for number
13 of existing programs.

14 In addition, the city has experienced some
15 misallocation of disposal tonnage, inert facility disposal
16 and CalTrans disposal tonnage that impacted their
17 diversion rate.

18 Board staff has worked with the city and CalTrans
19 to resolve these issues. Due to Board C&D policy adopted
20 in January of 2002, staff was able to deduct 300 tons of
21 C&D waste in 2000. Staff also deducted 400 tons of
22 dislocated tonnage and 36 tons of inert materials that was
23 disposed at one of the Los Angeles inert landfills.

24 These deductions increased the city's diversion
25 rate from 37 percent to 39 percent.

1 The city has requested that we describe to the
2 Board in this presentation their perspective on projects
3 impacting the city.

4 The data was not available for further tonnage
5 deductions. The City states that they have experienced
6 the following over the last few years:

7 A 275 million realignment of six lanes of freeway
8 over 5.2 miles. According to the city, city occupies only
9 3.8 square miles. Six overpasses with 47 columns more
10 than 120 feet high. A 90 million gallon water pipeline
11 project to supply 200,000 homes. And a future
12 right-of-way by carpool lanes.

13 The city staff further states that conservative
14 estimates of waste generated from CalTrans projects was
15 8,500 tons in 1998 and 9,500 tons in 1999.

16 For the 2000 annual reports the city and Board
17 staff were only able to confirm 300 tons of waste from
18 subcontractors assumed to be involved in the freeway
19 project. Since the city only generated approximately
20 23,000 tons of municipal solid waste in 2000, they're
21 requesting we bring to the Board's attention the potential
22 impacts of these projects on their diversion rate over the
23 last few years.

24 The city anticipates a 12-percent increase in
25 diversion to the time extension. Board staff determined

1 that the information submitted in the application is
2 adequately documented, and it's recommending that the
3 Board approve the city's time extension request with the
4 expanded program identified in plan of correction.

5 This concludes my presentation.

6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions members?

7 I have just one.

8 CalTrans did -- I understand only a small piece
9 of that freeway is really attached to Lemon Grove. Did
10 CalTrans make attempts to recycle a lot of that material?

11 MS. SATTER: Yes.

12 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay, good. I thought they
13 did when I read it. But even the impact of -- you know, I
14 mean they can't -- they're not going to be able to recycle
15 a hundred percent of it usually. That impact is what
16 causes the huge problem.

17 All right. Any other questions?

18 Mr. Medina.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.

20 I'd like to move resolution 2002-716,
21 consideration of the application for a 1066 time extension
22 by the city of Lemon Grove, San Diego County.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

24 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Mr.
25 Medina, a second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

1 Substitute the previous roll?

2 On consent?

3 Thank you, members.

4 Our Chair's home city.

5 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Committee Item --

6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I read "Park" and not -- I'm
7 sorry about that.

8 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Now we're in Los
9 Angeles County.

10 Okay. Committee Item N, Board item 41, is
11 consideration of the application for and SB 1066 time
12 extension by the city of Huntington Park, Los Angeles
13 County.

14 Steve Uselton will present.

15 MR. USELTON: Good morning, Committee members.

16 The city of Huntington Park has requested a time
17 extension through July 31,2004. The primary barriers that
18 have prevented the city from early program implementation
19 includes separate legal matters regarding residential and
20 commercial hauling services that have restricted the
21 city's ability to provide diversion services.

22 Of the three legal matters that the city was
23 facing, two of them resolved and one is still pending.

24 Even with the existence of this pending legal
25 action the city has reported to Board staff that the city

1 can and will move forward with the programs identified in
2 their time extension.

3 The reasons the city needs a time extension are
4 as follows:

5 The city will be implementing a citywide
6 automated curbside program for the collection of mixed
7 recyclables and green waste. It should be noted here that
8 the green waste collection program was not originally
9 identified in the city's Source Reduction and Recycling
10 Element, and they will be adding this as an alternative.

11 The city will also provide technical assistance
12 to its commercial sector and promote source-separated
13 recycling through rate incentives for the customer.

14 The city has experienced difficulty with
15 commercial sector recycling due to limited space for
16 source-separated recycling containers and traditionally
17 low recycling yields from the small businesses. However,
18 the city will work with its commercial hauler to route
19 specified commercial loads from such businesses to a
20 waste-to-energy facility.

21 The city anticipates an 11-percent increase in
22 its diversion rate from the programs just outlined.

23 Board staff has determined that the information
24 submitted in the application is adequately documented.
25 And based on this information Board staff is recommending

1 that the Board approve the city's time extension request.

2 The city representatives are available to answer
3 questions.

4 And this concluded my presentation.

5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?

6 Madam Chair.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'd like to
8 move approval of Resolution 2002-717, consideration of an
9 application for an SB 1066 time extension by the city of
10 Huntington Park, Los Angeles County.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

12 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Chair
13 Moulton-Patterson, a second by Mr. Medina.

14 Substitute the previous roll?

15 On consent?

16 Thank you, members.

17 Mr. Schiavo.

18 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Committee Item O, Board
19 Item 42, is consideration of the application for an SB
20 1066 time extension by the city of Adelanto, San
21 Bernardino County.

22 And Rebecca Brown will make this presentation.

23 MS. BROWN: The city of Adelanto has requested a
24 time extension through 2003. The city's current diversion
25 rate is 37 percent.

1 The plan of correction included expansion of
2 programs that would result in an estimated increase in
3 diversion of 3.5 percent, which would only give the city a
4 total estimated diversion of 40.5 percent at the
5 completion of the time of the extension.

6 Staff discussed the shortcomings with the city of
7 Adelanto and confirmed their intent to request a time
8 extension and not an alternative diversion requirement.
9 The city staff understand and concur with the Board's
10 staff recommendation to disapprove the request and provide
11 the opportunity to revise and submit the application
12 within 30 days.

13 This concludes my presentation. There is not a
14 representative from the city present.

15 If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer
16 them.

17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Madam Chair.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'd like to
19 move Resolution 2002-718, for an application for an SB
20 1066 time extension by the city of Adelanto, San
21 Bernardino County.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

23 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. So this motion -- I
24 mean this resolution is to disapprove but give them time
25 to resubmit, and they understand that?

1 MS. BROWN: Right.

2 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Members, substitute
3 the previous roll?

4 On consent?

5 Thank you, members.

6 All right. Next.

7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Items P and Q, 43 and
8 44 Board agenda, are consideration of the applications for
9 SB 1066 time extensions for the city of Pleasant Hill and
10 Clayton, both in contra Costa County.

11 And Eric Bissinger will make these presentations.

12 MS. BISSINGER: Good morning, Chairman and
13 Committee members.

14 The city of Pleasant Hill has requested a time
15 extension through December 31st, 2004, and the city
16 Clayton has requested an alternative diversion rate of 40
17 percent also through December 31st, 2004.

18 The city of Pleasant Hill needs additional time
19 to implement and expand the programs identified in the
20 plan of correction, including expanded curbside recycling
21 capacity and a C&D ordinance.

22 The city of Clayton has requested an alternative
23 diversion rate through December 2004. However, staff is
24 recommending that the extension be granted through
25 December 31st, 2003.

1 The city has requested an alternative diversion
2 requirement in lieu of a time extension because the city
3 believes that despite its good faith efforts it will be
4 unable to meet the 50-percent goal.

5 The city has been having difficulties reaching 50
6 percent because the city is 85 percent residential, with
7 only a small amount commercial businesses. And its prior
8 collection system was not adequately capturing residential
9 recyclables.

10 In addition, the city claims that the 1990 base
11 year is inaccurate and will be performing a generation
12 study to document all diversion activities.

13 Board staff determined that the information
14 submitted in both applications is adequately documented
15 and is recommending that the Board approve the city of
16 Pleasant Hill's time extension request to December 2004,
17 with the inclusion of outreach and public education
18 programs, promoting new and expanded programs identified
19 in the plan of correction.

20 Board staff also recommends that the Board
21 approve the city of clayton's alternative diversion rate
22 through December 2003.

23 This concludes my presentation. And city
24 representatives are here to answer any questions.

25 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?

1 Mr. White, you just were available if there were
2 questions?

3 MR. WHITE: Correct.

4 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay.

5 Yes.

6 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Board Member Jones, I'd
7 like to mention also that we have an error in the
8 resolution for Clayton. The bottom of Attachment 3, the
9 resolution. It should read "40 percent until December
10 31st, 2003," not 2004. So we have a --

11 CHAIRPERSON JONES: So change -- okay, got you.

12 Okay. Madam Chair.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Yeah, I'd
14 like to move Resolution 2002-714, consideration of an
15 application for SB 1066 time extension by the city of
16 Pleasant Hill, Contra Costa County.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

18 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion by Chair
19 Moulton-Patterson, a second by Mr. Medina.

20 Substitute the previous roll?

21 On consent?

22 Thank you members.

23 Madam Chair.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'd like to
25 move Resolution 2002-720, with the revision of 2003 down

1 at the bottom, for the consideration of the application
2 for an SB 1066 alternative diversion requirement by the
3 city of Clayton, Contra Costa County.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion by Chair
6 Moulton-Patterson, a second by Mr. Medina.

7 Substitute the previous roll?

8 Put it on consent?

9 All right. Next.

10 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. Item R, Board
11 Agenda Item 45, is consideration of the application for an
12 SB 1066 time extension or alternative diversion
13 requirement by the cities of Brawley, Calexico,
14 Calipatria, Holtville, Imperial, and Westmoreland, all in
15 Imperial County.

16 And Tara Gauthier will make this presentation.

17 MS. GAUTHIER: Good morning, Committee members.

18 The cities of Brawley, Calexico, Calipatria,
19 Holtville, Imperial, and Westmoreland in Imperial County
20 have requested SB 1066 time extensions or alternative
21 diversion requirements through 2004.

22 The SB 1066 plans as submitted are not adequately
23 described. There are inconsistencies between the
24 diversion rates requested and the total diversion rates of
25 the proposed activities in two of the ADR's.

1 None of the plans of correction or
2 goal-achievement section diversion rates appear to Board
3 staff to be realistic calculations of the projected
4 diversion rates. Therefore, Board staff would recommend
5 that additional diversion programs be added to the plans
6 or that alternative diversion rates be requested if
7 additional programs cannot be identified.

8 Staff has discussed the inadequacies of the plans
9 with the local jurisdiction representatives. They
10 understand and concur with the staff recommendation
11 disapproving the request and providing the opportunity to
12 revise and resubmit the applications within 30 days.

13 This concludes my presentation.

14 The cities do not have a representative present.
15 However, I would be happy to attempt to answer for them.

16 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Any questions,
17 members?

18 I have one.

19 J. B. West, is that the beer -- I mean is that --
20 who's J. B. West? Is that a consulting company or the
21 beer distributor?

22 MS. GAUTHIER: J. B. West is a representative of
23 the Joint Powers Authority in Imperial County.

24 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. We went to a thing,
25 and I couldn't remember the name of the person that was

1 doing all the recycling activity. I didn't know if it was
2 this. Because if it was, I think we needed to give them
3 an awful lot of help.

4 Are you guys prepared to go help these folks over
5 the next 30 days to identify issues?

6 MS. GAUTHIER: In fact, yes, we plan to visit.

7 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. I just have two quick
8 questions before I hear a motion.

9 Imperial County obviously is dealing with some
10 water issues right now. Any of their agricultural waste
11 that had been going to a landfill -- I mean, do we know
12 where some of that waste is going from -- the ag waste?
13 Because there's some -- you know, there's obviously burn
14 restrictions and other things from the way they used to
15 take care of it.

16 Is there a potential there to start looking at
17 some composting operations using that ag feedstock and
18 getting it back into those fields? I mean, you know --

19 MS. MORGAN: Cara Morgan.

20 Board Member Jones, through the base year studies
21 that the cities submitted, actually a majority of the ag
22 is already going back into animal feed or being tilled
23 back in. There's a variety.

24 We didn't see a lot that's actually still -- or
25 is being disposed of.

1 The JPA representatives are very much aware of
2 that and are looking for any other areas where there is
3 disposals so they can target those programs. But they've
4 been pretty successful at diverting the material.

5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. I just wanted to make
6 sure, because that would be a huge end-user for us -- or
7 for the industry all over.

8 All right. Any questions?

9 Mr. Medina.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.

11 With that I'd like to move Resolution 2002-721,
12 consideration of the applications for 1066 time extension
13 or alternative diversion requirement by the cities of
14 Brawley, Calexico, Calipatria, Holtville, Imperial, and
15 Westmoreland, in Imperial County.

16 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Mr.
17 Medina.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

19 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Second by Chair
20 Moulton-Patterson.

21 Substitute the previous roll?

22 On consent?

23 Thank you, members.

24 Yeah, they were a good host to us. We need to
25 help them out.

1 All right. Item 46, S.

2 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. Items S and T,
3 and also 46 and 47 in the Board packet, are considerations
4 of petitions for rural reductions of the diversion
5 requirements and consideration of the 1999-2000 biennial
6 review findings for the cities of Alturas and
7 unincorporated area of Modoc County.

8 And Jill Simmons will make this presentation.

9 MS. SIMMONS: Good morning, Chairman Jones and
10 Committee members.

11 One thing to know before I begin my presentation,
12 an updated petition for rural reduction application is
13 being handed out at this time for the city of Alturas.

14 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Have you reviewed it? I mean
15 are you --

16 MS. SIMMONS: Yes.

17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: This is what we're voting on
18 now?

19 MS. SIMMONS: Yes. What happened was the
20 petition for rural reduction for Glenn County had been
21 standing for the city of Alturas --

22 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah, I noticed that. That's
23 why it's not in my thing. I'm going, "What the heck is
24 this?"

25 MS. SIMMONS: Right, right. That was just

1 discovered late last night.

2 The city of Alturas and the unincorporated area
3 of Modoc County have both submitted applications to
4 petition for rural reductions. Both the city and the
5 county are able to make this request since it has been
6 determined by Board staff that they meet the statutory
7 definition of rural.

8 In 1994, the Board granted the city and the
9 county reduced diversion goals of 36 percent and 37
10 percent respectively.

11 For the year 2000 the city achieved a 16-percent
12 diversion rate and the county achieved a 13-percent
13 diversion rate. These are the further reduced goals each
14 is requesting.

15 The city and the county have implemented most of
16 their SRRE selected programs, including several
17 alternative programs. However, the city and the county do
18 not anticipate being able to attain their previously
19 Board-approved diversion rates due to the following rural
20 barriers:

21 The geographic remoteness of the county. There
22 is only one recycling center in the entire county.
23 Seventy-five percent of the land in Modoc County is either
24 owned by the Modoc National Forest Service or the Bureau
25 of Land Management.

1 The county suffers from severe chronic long-term
2 economic distress. Landfill operations do not have the
3 volume to subsidize recycling and other mandated programs.
4 And these programs are not feasible without outside
5 subsidized funding due to the remoteness of the county
6 from larger industrial areas.

7 Board staff has determined that the information
8 submitted in the application is adequately documented.
9 Based on this information, Board staff is recommending
10 that the Board approve both submitted applications for
11 rural reductions.

12 A representative for the city and county is
13 present to answer any questions.

14 This concludes my presentation. Thank you.

15 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Any questions,
16 members?

17 Madam Chair.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,
19 Chairman Jones.

20 Having visited Alturas this summer, I can vouch
21 it is remote and it is rural. And I had a very good tour
22 there. And I think they're doing very well with some of
23 the constraints they have.

24 So with that, I'd like to move Resolution
25 2002-722, consideration of a petition for a rural

1 reduction of the diversion requirements and consideration
2 of the '99-2000 biennial review findings for the Source
3 Reduction and Recycling Element and Household Hazardous
4 Waste Element for the city of Alturas, Modoc County.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion by Chair
7 Moulton-Patterson, a second by Mr. Medina.

8 Substitute the previous roll?

9 On consent?

10 Thank you, members.

11 Madam Chair.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'd also
13 like to move Resolution 2002-723. This is a consideration
14 of a petition for the rural reduction of the diversion
15 requirements and consideration of the '99-2000 biennial
16 review findings for the Source Reduction and Recycling
17 Elements and Household Hazardous Waste Elements for the
18 unincorporated area of Modoc County.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

20 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion Chair Linda
21 Moulton-Patterson and a second by Mr. Medina.

22 Substitute the previous roll?

23 On consent?

24 Thank you, members.

25 Item 48, U.

1 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: U is consideration of a
2 request to change the base year to 2000 for the city of
3 Pomona, Los Angeles County.

4 And Steve Uselton will present.

5 MR. USELTON: Good morning again, Committee
6 members.

7 The city of Pomona submitted a request to change
8 their base year from 1990 to the Year 2000. The city of
9 Pomona originally submitted a new base year change with a
10 requested diversion rate of 41 percent for 2000.

11 As part of the base year study review Board staff
12 conducted a detailed site visit. Changes proposed by
13 Board staff can be seen in their entirety in Attachment 3
14 to this item. With these changes the staff recommended
15 diversion rate for 2000 would be 40 percent.

16 The major programs that the city implemented
17 during 2000 were residential green waste and recycling
18 collection, commercial diversion, and C&D materials
19 recycling. The city has indicated to Board staff that it
20 will prepare a time extension to improve program
21 performance so that it can achieve diversion requirements.
22 Staff will bring forward the application at a future Board
23 meeting.

24 Board staff is recommending Option 2 of the
25 agenda item, which approve the revised new base year with

1 staff recommendations.

2 A representative from the jurisdiction is present
3 to answer any questions.

4 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions?

5 Mr. Medina.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.

7 I'd like to move Resolution 2002-724,
8 consideration of a request to change the base year to 2000
9 for the previously approve Source Reduction and Recycling
10 Element for the city of Pomona, Los Angeles County.

11 CHAIRPERSON JONES: And I'll second.

12 We're going to call the roll. And we'll leave
13 the roll open for a little bit.

14 Jeannine, call the roll please.

15 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Medina?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Ayes.

17 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Jones?

18 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Aye.

19 And we'll leave the roll open.

20 Next item.

21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. Item V, Board
22 Item 49, is consideration of a request to change the base
23 year to 1999 for the previously approved Source Reduction
24 and Recycling Element for the city Torrance in Los Angeles
25 County.

1 And Zane Poulson will make the presentation.

2 MR. POULSON: Good morning, Chair and members of
3 the Committee.

4 On October 26th, 1999, the city of Torrance was
5 issued a compliance order requiring the city to correct a
6 diversion rate inaccuracies. The city completed and
7 submitted a new waste generation study with the intent of
8 establishing a more recent and more accurate base year.

9 The city originally submitted a new base year
10 change request with a diversion rate of 27 percent for
11 1999.

12 As part of the base year study review Board staff
13 conducted a detailed site visit. Board staff proposed
14 changes can be seen in their entirety in Attachment 3.

15 Upon completion of the verification the city was
16 given additional time to submit more diversion tonnage
17 from large generators not originally included in the
18 study.

19 Additionally, the city used statistical methods
20 to extrapolate the nonresidential diversion from a sample
21 of businesses within the city. Contracted statisticians
22 along with Board staff reviewed the extrapolation
23 methodologies, and it was determined that the sampling
24 methodologies used in the extrapolation do not meet
25 statistical requirements for conducting random surveys.

1 Therefore, Board staff recommends that the additional
2 diversion from extrapolation not be allowed in the new
3 base year request.

4 With these changes the city's diversion rate for
5 1999 would be 20 percent.

6 One of the requirements of the city's compliance
7 order is that the city document its progress in meeting
8 the 25 percent diversion requirement and demonstrate
9 progress in meeting the 50-percent diversion requirement
10 in 2000.

11 Based on this information Board staff is
12 recommending Option 2 of the agenda item, which would
13 approve the Board staff to revise base year change
14 recommendations and direct staff to work with the city to
15 develop an assistance plan.

16 This concludes my presentation. Thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions?

18 I just have two things I want to hit.

19 This was the city, members, that had paid for two
20 different consultants and was ready to get into the second
21 phase of compliance, the evaluation of their programs.

22 And we had talked to them and made all the members aware
23 that, you know, maybe we need to do extensions or
24 something. They did get their numbers taken. They were
25 brought in and their numbers were low. So obviously, I'm

1 assuming, that second part of the compliance is to go out
2 and really evaluate the programs to figure out what we
3 need to do, even though they've got a new base year.

4 My other question is -- and you may have handled
5 it. There were 400 businesses contacted, but only 279
6 actually participated. It means 121 blew it off. When
7 we're looking at stuff like that, especially when there's
8 extrapolation, that zero can't just be dismissed as
9 "nobody home." It's got to be an indication that they're
10 not doing programs. So 100 percent of their waste goes to
11 a landfill.

12 Is anybody ever factoring that in when we do
13 these types of math exercises? I mean, clearly, it is --
14 if somebody's not going to tell us, for whatever reason,
15 that they're not doing any programs, it means they're
16 doing no programs. So that's the assumption that's got to
17 be made, not when it's almost half of the jurisdictions
18 and at such a low number. I mean you're at 20 percent for
19 a reason. Nobody's participating.

20 So we need to look at this as an indicator, I
21 think, of zero participation by those businesses, and not
22 just dismiss it as somebody that didn't want to take the
23 time. Because most people that are doing programs are
24 willing to tell you what they're doing. And that's been a
25 flaw in these base years, I think, from an awful lot of

1 folks that put them together, that they dismiss
2 nonresponsive as still being able to be extrapolated that
3 they're having programs. And that's problematic.

4 So if you're not looking at that, I think it
5 warrants -- you are looking at it. Okay.

6 I really think it warrants a little bit of a
7 description in each one of these, which you did this time.
8 But I mean -- because it's an indicator, you know. People
9 are just not getting into it, and the city needs to know
10 that. I mean that's a huge indicator to a city, I would
11 think.

12 Any questions?

13 Mr. Medina.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.
15 I concur with your remarks.

16 And I'd like to move Resolution 2002-771,
17 consideration of request to change the base year to 1999
18 for the previously approved Source Reduction and Recycling
19 Element for the city of Torrance, Los Angeles County.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Mr.
22 Medina, a second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

23 Substitute -- We can't do that.

24 Call the roll, Jeannine, pleas.

25 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Medina?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.

2 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Moulton-Patterson?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.

4 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Jones?

5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Aye.

6 Consent, members?

7 Thank you.

8 Jeannine -- on the Item 48, U, Madam Chair, we
9 left the vote open.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Yes. I'd
11 like to vote yes.

12 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. That would be 3-0.

13 And put it on consent, members?

14 All right. 3-0 on consent on Pomona.

15 And 3-0 consent on Torrance.

16 Item 50 -- you okay, Jim? We okay?

17 Item 50, which would be W in our Committee -- are
18 you sure you don't want to take a break before we do the
19 city of L.A.? Who knows.

20 Why don't we take 10 minutes just for the heck of
21 it.

22 I don't think there's going to be an issue. But
23 you know what, you never know.

24 Ten minutes. We'll be back here at 11 o'clock.

25 (Thereupon a recess was taken.)

1 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Mr. Medina is on his
2 way down. So I think we can start with Item W, number 50,
3 the city of Los Angeles.

4 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. And this is
5 consideration of a request to change the base year to 2000
6 and consideration of the 1999-2000 biennial review
7 findings for the city of Los Angeles, as you said, Los
8 Angeles County.

9 Steve Uselton will present.

10 MR. USELTON: Good morning again, Board members.

11 Originally the city of Los Angeles submitted a
12 request for a new base year, claiming a diversion rate of
13 62 percent for the year the 2000.

14 The city worked with board staff to document the
15 processes that were used to avoid double counting of
16 diversion information throughout the study. Through the
17 city's own internal review of these processes and of
18 double counting potential, a significant amount of tonnage
19 was removed prior to the study being submitted to Board
20 staff.

21 In addition Board staff conducted site visits to
22 the city and verified the claimed diversion. Through
23 verification findings Board staff recommends several
24 deductions as well as additions. Changes can be seen in
25 their entirety on Attachment 3 of the agenda item.

1 Board staff is recommending the base year be
2 approved at 59 percent. With transformation credit
3 available in the year 2000, the city's 2000 diversion rate
4 would be 60 percent.

5 Staff also conducted a review of city's diversion
6 programs. Board staff's review finds that the city is
7 adequately implementing source reduction, recycling,
8 composting, and public education programs described in the
9 city's Source Reduction and Recycling Element in order to
10 achieve the 50-percent diversion requirement.

11 Based on this information Board staff is
12 recommending Option 2 of the agenda item, which would
13 approve the revised based year, with staff
14 recommendations, and accept the 1999-2000 biennial review
15 findings.

16 Representatives from the city are present to
17 answer questions.

18 And that concludes my presentation.

19 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Members, do we have any
20 questions?

21 Okay. Madam Chair.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,
23 Chairman Jones.

24 I'd like to go ahead and move Resolution
25 2002-725, consideration of a request to change the base

1 year to 2000 for the previously approved Source Reduction
2 and Recycling Element and consideration of the 1999-2000
3 biennial review findings for the Source Reduction and
4 Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element
5 for the city of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

7 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Chair
8 Moulton-Patterson, a second by Mr. Medina.

9 Would you call the roll.

10 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Medina?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.

12 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Moulton-Patterson?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.

14 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Jones?

15 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Aye.

16 Consent, members?

17 Okay. This will be on consent.

18 Item -- oh, no.

19 We have a presentation.

20 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Yeah. Before Item X we
21 would like to have a short presentation related to Item 36
22 in the Board packet by representatives of Orange County.

23 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was

24 Presented as follows.)

25 Mr. McCarron: Good morning. My name is Pat

1 McCarron. I'm the Director of Maintenance Services of the
2 city of Brea. On behalf of the city of Brea, I'd like to
3 thank you for your time here today and for considering the
4 findings of our study.

5 We have developed a concise presentation
6 outlining several disposal reporting problems at the
7 Brea-Olinda Landfill, their impacts on Brea's diversion
8 rate, and why these problems occur.

9 I will also present the compelling results of a
10 comprehensive study conducted at the suggestion of the
11 staff at the California Integrated Waste Management Board.

12 It is our assertion that Brea's landfill
13 diversion rate as reported is skewed by misreported
14 tonnage. We feel our presentation this morning supports
15 this conclusion.

16 I'd like to point out that the County of Orange
17 has been very responsive and very instrumental in helping
18 us with this problem and has worked closely with us to try
19 and find a mutually agreeable course of action.

20 --o0o--

21 MR. McCARRON: The problem. In Orange county
22 out-of-county self-hauled trash is prohibited by county
23 ordinance. However, it is generally understood that
24 out-of-county trash has been illegally dumped for a number
25 of years in violation of this ordinance. While this is

1 common acknowledge, we realize that we need to officially
2 document the practice.

3 Additionally, as previously mentioned, the staff
4 of the Integrated Waste Management Board suggested that we
5 study the reporting problem and capture data to prove it
6 once and for all. I'll review how the study was conducted
7 and discuss the findings in more depth in a few moments.

8 Over the years several factors involving nearby
9 landfills have played a role regarding the increase of
10 illegal self-haul disposal at the Brea-Olinda Landfill.

11 --o0o--

12 MR. McCARRON: To orient you before I review
13 these factors, let's look at the map that shows the
14 location of the Brea-Olinda Landfill, the Pointy Hills
15 Landfill, and the closed Spadra and BKK Landfills. It
16 also points out the border of Los Angeles and Orange
17 County, the border of -- San Bernardino County, and the
18 location of the city of Brea and the 57 Freeway.

19 --o0o--

20 MR. McCARRON: The closure of the BKK Landfill in
21 West Covina and Spadra in Pomona and the resulting
22 increased wait times at the Pointy Hills Landfill makes
23 the Brea-Olinda Landfill logistically and economically
24 attractive for south Los Angeles County haulers to
25 utilize.

1 When BKK closed in 1996 Brea's diversion rate
2 dropped from 41 percent to 14 percent even with additional
3 programs in place.

4 The subsequent closure of Spadra Landfill in 2000
5 put more pressure on the already over-utilized Pointy
6 Hills Landfill, resulting in early closures based upon
7 capacity limits. Wait times at the Pointy Hills Landfill
8 increased to at times two hours, which is in sharp
9 contrast to a average wait time at the Brea-Olinda
10 Landfill.

11 Additionally the San Bernardino Landfill's
12 tipping fees are currently 26 percent higher than the
13 self-haul rate charged at the Brea-Olinda Landfill.

14 Clearly there are significant factors, out of the
15 control of the city of Brea, that compel out-of-county
16 self-haulers to illegally use the Brea-Olinda Landfill by
17 misrepresenting the origin of their haul.

18 --o0o--

19 MR. McCARRON: The staff of the California
20 Integrated Waste Management Board requested that we
21 substantiate our conclusions. With the help of the
22 county, we conducted an extensive self-haul survey at the
23 Brea-Olinda Landfill on Monday, August 12th, and Tuesday,
24 August 13th, of this year. The survey was coordinated --
25 it was a coordinated effort with the city of Brea and

1 County of Orange landfill staff, Brea Police Department,
2 and Taormina Industries.

3 Ten people from these different organizations
4 were on the survey team. They surveyed the landfill
5 operation for ten hours on both days from opening to
6 closing. A total of 200 staff hours were devoted to the
7 two-day study, plus many more hours planning and
8 developing the format as well as compiling and analyzing
9 the results. The survey team interviewed the drivers of
10 83 vehicles during the two-day period.

11 --o0o--

12 MR. McCARRON: This photo shows the location of
13 one of the spotters on the southbound 57 Freeway at
14 Imperial Highway. Spotters were located at the exit of
15 the 57 Freeway southbound, watching traffic coming from
16 L.A., and on Carbon Canyon Highway westbound with a view
17 of vehicles coming from the San Bernardino/Riverside
18 areas.

19 --o0o--

20 MR. McCARRON: This map shows the location of the
21 spotters, the 57 Freeway, the county borders, and the
22 routes taken by the self-haul vehicles in the site of the
23 Brea-Olinda Landfill.

24 The spotters had two-way communication
25 capabilities so they could call ahead to the scale house

1 with descriptions of each truck. By noting the trucks
2 traveling from the L.A. and San Bernardino areas team
3 members at the scale house were armed with definitive
4 information when confronted with a driver who identified
5 his haul as coming from Brea.

6 --o0o--

7 MR. McCARRON: This photo shows a truck that was
8 spotted coming off the south 57 Freeway.

9 Once at the scale house all self-haul vehicles
10 that reported their tonnage was from Brea were pulled
11 aside and surveyed.

12 --o0o--

13 MR. McCARRON: This shows a truck at the scale
14 house. During the interview many drivers recanted their
15 original statement regarding the origin of their load.
16 Upon further questioning of these drivers, who were
17 identified by spotters, even more modified their
18 statements.

19 --o0o--

20 MR. McCARRON: This photo of a driver being
21 interrogated.

22 (Laughter.)

23 --o0o--

24 MR. McCARRON: What did we learn?

25 At the end of the two-day study we had gathered

1 enough information to prove a point we had known for
2 years -- the current reported tonnage charged to Brea by
3 the county is incorrect. Of the 137 tons of waste
4 attributed to Brea over a two-day period, 40 percent of
5 Brea origin was verifiable, 15 percent was questionable,
6 and 45 percent was determined to be misrepresented as
7 originating from Brea.

8 The reality is that the out-of-county self-haul
9 trash is coming into the Orange County landfill system.

10 --o0o--

11 MR. McCARRON: Out-of-county haulers have to
12 misrepresent the origin of their haul or be turned away to
13 use a less desirable alternate site. Loads from other
14 Orange County cities were being reported as being from the
15 host city of Brea, especially Brea-based businesses like
16 roofers and flooring contractors.

17 --o0o--

18 MR. McCARRON: The city and county audit of
19 reported self-haul tonnage also provided interesting
20 information. When the misrepresented tonnage was removed
21 from the equation, the adjusted tonnage fell within
22 realistic parameters: 12 percent to 16 percent of the
23 total disposed in the landfill. State average is 11
24 percent; county average is 14.

25 The diversion rates from the adjusted disposal

1 were also more realistic: 50 percent to 52 percent.
2 Diversion rates from other cities served by Taormina with
3 the similar programs ranged from 47 percent to 65 percent.

4 The results proved that the city of Brea is in
5 compliance with AB 939.

6 --o0o--

7 MR. McCARRON: Based on the results of the
8 survey, the County of Orange has increased their
9 enforcement efforts. Let me introduce Sue Gordan, Manager
10 of Environment Programs of the County of Orange Integrated
11 Waste Management Department, to briefly discuss their plan
12 for corrective action.

13 MS. GORDAN: Good morning. How are you?

14 I'm going to be very brief. We've had a long
15 presentation.

16 The county has developed a plan for the Olinda
17 Alpha Landfill that's designed to discourage out-of-county
18 self-haulers from misrepresenting the origin of their
19 loads. We have also worked to clarify surveying
20 procedures and to revise the training for scale-house
21 employees to improve the accuracy of the data for
22 out-of-Brea self-haulers. I'll go over some of the
23 specifics.

24 We're posting additional signs in Spanish and
25 English describing our self-haul procedures and our

1 ordinance prohibiting out-of-county waste. Here's a photo
2 showing the signs that we've posted.

3 --o0o--

4 MS. GORDAN: We've taken additional training for
5 our fee station attendants, specialized; taught them how
6 to ask the right questions at the scale house. We've
7 developed resources for them, such as fliers in English
8 and in Spanish that they can hand to the individuals as
9 they're coming through the gate; how they can survey
10 commercial and public self-haulers. We're documenting the
11 Brea-reported addresses of origin, and so the city can
12 follow up on those at a later date. We're also
13 considering increasing self-haul fees or establishing
14 other fees to encourage self-haulers to utilize local
15 processing facilities, which will benefit all
16 jurisdictions with improved diversion.

17 And, again, I thank you for your time today. And
18 I assure you that correcting this problem is the
19 county's -- one of its top priorities.

20 Thank you.

21 MR. McCARRON: In closing, the city of Brea has
22 been a long-standing leader in Orange County with
23 recycling programs. The next two slides list Brea's
24 diversion program.

25 --o0o--

1 MR. McCARRON: Three-can system, bulky-item
2 pickup, recycling, composting, neighborhood cleanup,
3 commercial processing, buy-back centers -- the usual.

4 Based on the proactive response by the city and
5 the county we feel that future reported tonnage will more
6 accurately reflect the actual disposal rates.

7 We very much thank the Committee for the
8 opportunity to present this information. We appreciate
9 your attention.

10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.

12 Any questions?

13 I know that you've got some of the same issues,
14 Ms. Gordan, up in the San Clemente issues and some places
15 like that. I think one of those cities, different hauler,
16 but they showed 48 percent self-haul when they are the
17 exclusive hauler.

18 Same issues that the Teramina's operations face.

19 And it's got to be a pretty daunting task. I've
20 heard some rumors about some knew conditions that L.A.
21 County's looking at. You know, when the Board prior to me
22 getting here was talking about the DRS and the reporting,
23 there was a lot of folks that thought that it should be
24 done everyday. And the will at the time was to do it
25 quarterly. And I think it's pretty obvious that, you

1 know, something's got to be done because a lot of
2 jurisdictions are getting killed with tonnage being
3 assigned.

4 And, you know, there's some cities that are going
5 to see their diversion numbers go down when waste starts
6 getting assigned to the accurate places; that those that
7 felt real good are going to be feeling like, "Well, I
8 guess it's time to crank up some programs." So it's, you
9 know, for everyone that gets -- their diversion goes down,
10 somebody else is going up. So it's a huge issue.

11 Thanks for the presentation. We appreciate it.

12 Members, any questions?

13 All right. Thank you.

14 Mr. Schiavo.

15 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. Items X, Y, and
16 Z -- 51, 52, and 53 in your Board book -- are
17 consideration of request to change the base year to 2000
18 for the cities of Lafayette, Danville, and Walnut Creek in
19 Contra Costa County.

20 And Eric Bissinger will make these presentations.

21 MS. BISSINGER: Good morning, Committee members.

22 The cities of Lafayette, Danville, and Walnut
23 Creek have submitted requests to change their base year to
24 Year 2000.

25 As part of their base-year study review, Board

1 staff conducted site visits for all three cities. As a
2 result deductions were made to the construction and
3 demolition diversion amounts for each city. The cities
4 agree with the revised deductions. These changes can be
5 viewed in detail by referring to Attachment 3 of the
6 agenda item packets.

7 No extrapolation or business surveys were used to
8 calculate diversion amounts. This request is well
9 documented and is generally consistent with Board
10 standards for accuracy. Therefore, staff recommends the
11 Board approve the request to change the base years for
12 these cities to Year 2000.

13 This concludes my presentation. And a
14 representative from the cities are here available to
15 answer any questions.

16 Thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?

18 Mr. Medina.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.

20 I'd like to move Resolution 2002-727, a
21 consideration of a request to change the base year to 2000
22 for the previously approved Source Reduction and Recycling
23 Element for the city of Lafayette, Contra Costa County.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

25 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Mr.

1 Medina, a second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

2 Substitute the previous roll?

3 On consent?

4 Thank you, members.

5 Mr. Medina.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move
7 resolution 2002-729, consideration of request to change
8 the base year to 2000 for the previously approved Source
9 Reduction and Recycling Element for the city of Walnut
10 Creek, Contra Costa County.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

12 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion by Mr. Medina, a
13 second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

14 Was that 728?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: That was 729.

16 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay, 729, which is the city
17 of Walnut Creek.

18 We've got to do 728, right, Danville?

19 Okay. Mr. Medina.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Yes, I'd like to move
21 Resolution 2002-728 revised, consideration of a request to
22 change the base year to 2000 for the previously approved
23 Source Reduction and Recycling Element for the town of
24 Danville, Contra Costa County.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

1 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Mr.
2 Medina, a second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

3 Substitute the previous roll?

4 On consent?

5 All right. Those three are on consent.

6 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. Item AA, Board
7 Item 54, is a consideration of a request to change the
8 base year to 1998 and consideration of the 1999-2000
9 biennial review findings for the city of Cupertino in
10 Santa Clara County.

11 And Kathy Davis will present.

12 MS. DAVIS: Good morning.

13 The city originally submitted a new base year
14 change requesting a diversion rate of 50 percent for 1998.

15 As part of the base-year study review staff
16 conducted a detailed site visit. The site visit resulted
17 in several changes to the claimed diversion. Board staff
18 proposed changes are discussed in their entirety in
19 Attachment 3.

20 With the Board staff recommended changes to the
21 new base year, the city's diversion rate would be 44
22 percent for 1998. With the base year change as
23 recommended by Board staff, the city's diversion rate
24 would be 53 percent for 1999 and 58 percent for 2000.

25 There was extrapolation of residential and

1 nonresidential diversion data. This study was reviewed by
2 statisticians under contract with the Board to perform
3 reviews of studies that utilized extrapolation
4 methodologies.

5 The sampling methodology for nonresidential
6 diversion consisted of stratification by business sectors
7 likely to share a common waste stream and appears to be a
8 reasonable strategy for estimating diversion.

9 For residential extrapolation the city used a
10 simple random sampling methodology that was determined to
11 be statistically valid with a confidence rating greater
12 than 90 percent.

13 Staff also conducted a review of the city's
14 diversion programs. The city reported that they have
15 successfully implemented source reduction, recycling,
16 composting, and public education programs to meet the
17 50-percent diversion goal.

18 Board staff is recommending Option 2 of the
19 agenda item, which would approve the revised new base year
20 with staff recommendations and accept the '99-2000
21 biennial review findings.

22 Representatives from the staff are present to
23 answer any questions.

24 Thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?

1 An extrapolation that actually everybody was
2 comfortable with. I just want that on the record that
3 sometimes when they're done a certain way, it actually
4 gets approval.

5 Mr. Medina.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.

7 I'd like to move Resolution 2002-731,
8 consideration of a request to change the base year to 1998
9 for the previously approved Source Reduction and Recycling
10 Element and consideration of the '99-2000 biennial review
11 findings for the Source Reduction and Recycling Element
12 and Household Hazardous Waste Element for the city of
13 Cupertino, Santa Clara County.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

15 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Mr.
16 Medina, a second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

17 Substitute the previous roll?

18 On consent?

19 Thank you, members.

20 Item AB, number 55.

21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Consideration of a
22 request to change the base year to 1998 for the -- and the
23 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the city of
24 Beaumont, Riverside County.

25 And Melissa Vargas will present.

1 MS. VARGAS: Good morning, Committee members.

2 The city of Beaumont originally submitted a new
3 base-year change request with a diversion rate of 72
4 percent.

5 As part of the base-year study review, Board
6 staff conducted a detailed site visit. Board staff
7 proposed changes can be seen in Attachment 3 of the agenda
8 item packet. With Board staff recommended changes the
9 city's diversion rate remains at 72 percent for their 1998
10 proposed new base year.

11 With the Board staff recommended changes to the
12 city's proposed 1998 new base year, the diversion rate for
13 Beaumont would be 71 percent for 1999 and 69 percent for
14 2000.

15 Staff also conducted a review of the city's
16 diversion programs. The city reported that they have
17 successfully implemented source reduction, recycling,
18 composting, and public education programs in order to meet
19 the 50-percent diversion goal.

20 Based on this information Board staff is
21 recommending Option 2 of the agenda item, which would
22 approve the revised new base year with staff
23 recommendations and accept the 1999-2000 biennial review
24 findings.

25 A representative from the city is available to

1 answer any questions.

2 This concludes my presentation.

3 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions?

4 This is the one that's got the huge citrus stuff
5 that gets reused, right?

6 MS. VARGAS: Yes. And it's amazing. We actually
7 went down and visited the citrus plant. And what they --
8 they have a multitude of uses for their citrus rinds such
9 as it goes for uses for marmalade, shipped overseas to
10 Japan for tea. I mean it was just a fantastic operation.
11 Pretty impressive.

12 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Cool. They didn't put it
13 back in the batch and make new oranges out of --

14 (Laughter.)

15 MS. VARGAS: I hope not.

16 CHAIRPERSON JONES: No, good job. I mean
17 there's -- they are what they are. It's 26,000 tons of
18 orange peels out of 27,000 tons total. It is what it is,
19 you know. Some get the benefit of that.

20 Mr. Medina.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.

22 I'd like to move Resolution 2002-732,
23 consideration of a request to change the base year to 1998
24 for the previously approved Source Reduction and Recycling
25 Element and consideration of the '99-2000 biennial review

1 findings for the Source Reduction and Recycling Element
2 and Household Hazardous Waste Element for the city of
3 Beaumont, Riverside County.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Mr.
6 Medina and a second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

7 Substitute the previous roll?

8 On consent?

9 Thank you.

10 I had a question.

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Sure.

12 CHAIRPERSON JONES: You know on that one we did
13 in Imperial County, Westmoreland and all those? Wasn't
14 one of those cities the ones that had the liquor store
15 that was out in the middle of the fields that ended up
16 with like 50-percent diversion because of their -- because
17 of the beer boxes or something?

18 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Right. And we
19 have actual pictures showing the beer boxes. And we
20 have -- bus after bus would go through --

21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: And we had an agent pull them
22 up high enough?

23 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Didn't get them up high
24 enough.

25 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. I was thinking about

1 it afterwards. That was the one that Mr. Eaton went nuts
2 about.

3 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: In fact Phil and I were
4 driving by there. And there must have been about four
5 buses on site, two more were driving down the road. I
6 mean it was pretty amazing to see -- that's where they go.

7 CHAIRPERSON JONES: That's where they go. Cool.

8 Okay. It just crossed my mind during the break.

9 Okay. Now, we should get back to work.

10 Item 56, AC.

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: AC, Item 56, as you
12 said. Consideration of a request to change the base year
13 to 2000 in consideration of the 1999-2000 biennial review
14 findings for the unincorporated area of San Joaquin
15 County.

16 And Yasmin Satter will make this presentation.

17 MS. SATTER: Good morning, Chairman Jones and
18 Committee members.

19 The unincorporated area of San Joaquin County
20 submitted a request to change its base year from 1990 to
21 2000. The county originally submitted a new base year
22 change request with a diversion rate of 76 percent for
23 2000.

24 As part of the base year study review Board staff
25 conducted a detailed site visit. Board staff proposed

1 changes can be seen in Attachment 3 of the agenda item
2 packet. With Board staff recommended changes the county's
3 diversion rate is 66 percent for their 2000 proposed new
4 base year.

5 Staff also conducted a review of the county's
6 diversion programs. The county reported that they have
7 successfully implemented source reduction, recycling,
8 composting, and public education programs in order to meet
9 the 50-percent diversion goal.

10 Based on this information Board staff is
11 recommending Option 2 of the agenda item, which would
12 approve the revised new base year with the staff
13 recommendation and accept the 1999 and 2000 biennial
14 review findings.

15 Representatives from this county are present to
16 answer any questions you may have.

17 This concludes my presentation.

18 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Just a quick question.

19 The gray pumice that's -- it's being composted --

20 MS. SATTER: Yes.

21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: -- similar to what they're
22 doing up in Rutherford?

23 Are the growers taking that material back?

24 MS SATTER: Let me look at Attachment 3. We have
25 discussed that in Attachment 3 what has been done with

1 that.

2 CHAIRPERSON JONES: That's okay if you can't find
3 it. At least we know that they're composting. But I'd
4 like to know if it's going back into those agricultural
5 uses.

6 MS. SATTER: Yes. We had confirmed that with the
7 business.

8 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. That it is going back
9 into it?

10 MS. SATTER: Yes.

11 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Good.

12 All right. Madam Chair.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'd like to
14 move approval of Resolution 2002-733, a request to change
15 the base year to 2000 for the previously approved Source
16 Reduction and Recycling Element and consideration of the
17 '99-2000 biennial review findings for the Source Reduction
18 and Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste
19 Element for the unincorporated area of San Joaquin county.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Chair
22 Moulton-Patterson, a second by Mr. Medina.

23 Substitute the previous roll?

24 On consent?

25 Thank you, members.

1 Item AD, number 57, Brawley.

2 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: This is consideration
3 of a request to change the base year for the city of
4 Brawley, Imperial County.

5 And Tara will make this presentation.

6

7 MS. GAUTHIER: Good morning, Committee members.

8 The city of Brawley submitted a request to
9 correct its 1999 base year generation tonnage by including
10 previously uncounted diversion tonnage. The city has also
11 requested to correct its base year by including previously
12 uncounted sludge diversion.

13 With the base year corrected as requested, the
14 city's diversion rate for 1999 would be 41 percent.

15 Board staff has reviewed the city's sludge
16 petition and believes the city has not met the regulatory
17 and statutory requirements for claiming sludge diversion
18 credit. The city was unable to provide documentation
19 showing the sludge was disposed in the landfill in its
20 base year. Additionally, the landfill was not permitted
21 to accept water treatment plant sludge at that time.

22 Staff also recommends some minor corrections to
23 diversion tonnage due to differences in calculation
24 methods. Staff's recommended changes are fully described
25 in Attachment 3 of the agenda item.

1 The major programs related to the base year
2 correction that the city has proposed are commercial
3 self-haul, special collection events, inerts reuse, and
4 sludge diversion programs. Staff conducted verification
5 of these activities in November 2002.

6 Board staff is recommending Option 2 of the
7 agenda item which would approve the city's base year
8 correction with staff revisions, but disapprove its sludge
9 diversion request.

10 With the recommended changes Brawley's diversion
11 rate for 1999 would be 40 percent.

12 There is no representative available from the
13 jurisdiction to answer any questions.

14 This does conclude my presentation.

15 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. I have a question
16 about the sludge. But do any of the members?

17 If they had an exclusion that they could not
18 bring it to a local landfill -- right, back in 1990, their
19 sludge, couldn't bring it to a landfill, right? That's
20 the finding?

21 MS. GAUTHIER: The finding had to do with the
22 permit of the landfill plus --

23 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Right. So they couldn't take
24 it to a landfill?

25 MS. GAUTHIER: That's correct.

1 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Well, they had to take it
2 somewhere. So if they didn't dispose of it, they had to
3 be recycling it or doing land application.

4 So then doesn't it become an ongoing recycling
5 activity that would make it eligible?

6 And not to put you guy too much on the spot, if
7 you need to think this through a little bit, I can get an
8 answer at the Board meeting.

9 But if it can't go to a landfill, then it has to
10 be going somewhere. And those activities are recycling.
11 Land application is a positive end-use.

12 STAFF COUNSEL BLOCK: Elliot Block with the Legal
13 Office.

14 Just like all of the other diversion programs
15 that you have to deal with, there has to be some showing
16 of the minimal amount normally disposed in order to count
17 as diversion. So the same thing would apply for the
18 sludge diversion as well. If it had never been disposed
19 of in the landfill in the first place in some amount, then
20 our regulations provide the .001 percent of the waste
21 stream. Then it can't count as a preexisting diversion
22 program on there.

23 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. And a recycling
24 program that was 100 percent effective wouldn't count as
25 recycling, it wouldn't count -- so it wouldn't count as

1 generation?

2 STAFF COUNSEL BLOCK: That's correct.

3 CHAIRPERSON JONES: So it's outside the system.

4 So they're not penalized.

5 Okay. That's fair, if they're not penalized.

6 Because, I mean, it has to go somewhere. So that's cool.

7 Understood now. Thank you.

8 All right. Madam Chair.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,
10 Chairman Jones.

11 I'd like to move Resolution 2002-776, a request
12 to correct the 1999 base year for the previously approved
13 Source Reduction and Recycling Element for the city of
14 Brawley, Imperial county.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

16 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion by Chair
17 Moulton-Patterson, a second by Mr. Medina.

18 Substitute the previous roll?

19 On consent?

20 Thank you, members.

21 We're getting closer.

22 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: We're almost there.
23 The last page.

24 Item AE or Board Item 58 is consideration of a
25 request to change the base year to 2000 and consideration

1 of the 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the County
2 of Ventura.

3 And Tara will make this presentation.

4 MS. GAUTHIER: Thank you, Committee members.

5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: If your button on?

6 MS. GAUTHIER: It's on.

7 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. It's just that dainty
8 voice.

9 MS. GAUTHIER: Oh, I'll speak louder.

10 CHAIRPERSON JONES: There you go.

11 MS. GAUTHIER: Originally Ventura County
12 submitted a request for a new base year claiming a
13 diversion rate of 59 percent for 2000. As a result of
14 staff's visit to the county and verification of the
15 claimed diversion, Board staff is recommending acceptance
16 of the revised 2000 diversion rate of 54 percent.

17 Board staff recommends several deductions as well
18 as additions. Changes can be seen in their entirety in
19 Attachment 3 of the agenda item.

20 Board staff also reviewed the county's petition
21 for sludge diversion credit and have recommended changes
22 to reported sludge tonnages to count only the dry tonnages
23 as diversion. Board staff has discussed these proposed
24 changes with county representatives. The county
25 representatives have subsequently agreed with Board

1 staff's recommendations for the proposed changes in sludge
2 tonnages.

3 With Board staff recommended changes the 2000
4 base year would have a revised diversion rate of 54
5 percent.

6 Staff also conducted a review of the county's
7 diversion programs. The county reported that they have
8 successfully implemented source reduction, recycling,
9 composting, and public education programs in order to meet
10 the 50-percent diversion goal.

11 Based on this information Board staff is
12 recommending Option 2 of the agenda item, which would
13 approve the revised base year with staff recommendations
14 and accept the 1999-2000 biennial review findings.

15 Representatives from the county are present to
16 answer any questions.

17 This concludes my presentation.

18 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. I've got one speaker
19 slip.

20 But, members, any questions?

21 Gerard.

22 MR. KAPUSAK: Good morning, Chairman Jones and
23 members of the Board. My name is Gerard Kapusak, and I'm
24 the Information Technology Manager of the County of
25 Ventura's Environmental and Energy Resources Department,

1 formally known as the Solid Waste Management Department.
2 But we too have reinvented ourselves.

3 I would like to, first of all, thank the
4 tremendous efforts of your staff. They have been
5 extraordinarily professional. They've been tough, but
6 fair. They're also caring and sensitive human beings.
7 And I'm talking of course about Cara Morgan and Tara
8 Gauthier and Kaoru Cruz. We have enjoyed working for
9 them.

10 Secondly -- you probably don't hear this very
11 often, but thank you for promulgating regulations that
12 require us to have to measure the diversion and go through
13 this exercise. Because it's not only important to you and
14 us to meet the numerical compliance. It is important to
15 us to periodically go out in the community and get a
16 reality check of what is working and what isn't, and what
17 is really happening in the community rather than what we
18 think is happening. And that is the primary reason and
19 the primary long-term benefit to the County of Ventura of
20 this exercise. And we are going to and have already begun
21 to adjust our priorities, our focus, and our efforts to
22 match what's going on out there.

23 And what's going on out there is a remarkable
24 degree of initiative by many private sector partners with
25 ourselves as well as other public agencies to take the

1 best of technology and anticipate the trends in waste
2 diversion and reuse and recycling. Some extraordinary
3 opportunities.

4 You have of course visited us six months ago down
5 in Oxnard. The next time, we hope to persuade you, you'll
6 be able to see the new anaerobic gas digestion facility at
7 the California State University Channel Islands, which is
8 going to begin engineering and construction, and hopefully
9 will be built by the end of the year 2003.

10 So thank you very much for doing that. Thank you
11 for exercising the leadership. Thank you for working with
12 us. Thank you for giving your staff both the ability and
13 the resources to work with us and provide us with this
14 assistance.

15 I would like to close by saying that we do have
16 daily allocation-of-origin activity in Ventura County.
17 And in your new Info Cycling you'll see an article about
18 working with your staff to ensure that that is keeping --
19 the people are kept on their toes.

20 Our diversion study is not extrapolation based.
21 It is actually measured. And, trust me, we would have
22 been here about four months earlier, but it took that long
23 for my broken arm to heal based on Cara Morgan's visit.
24 She obviously chewed out five percent of our numbers. And
25 hopefully that won't result in five-percent reduction in

1 my salary.

2 And in any event, thank you very much. And I'd
3 be happy to answer any questions.

4 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?

5 I know that the Board appreciated the time in
6 Ventura. The chair made that very clear, as did all the
7 other members. But I think there's a reason that you guys
8 are 54 percent. I think it's your operations in Oxnard.
9 It's E. J. Harrison. It's the composting material. It's
10 those partnerships throughout the entire county that make
11 it that successful. And, you know, good for you guys.

12 MR. KAPUSAK: Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON JONES: All right. Who wants to do
14 this?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move
16 Resolution 2002-734, consideration of a request to change
17 the base year to 2000 for the previously approved Source
18 Reduction and Recycling Element and consideration of the
19 '99-2000 biennial review findings for the Source Reduction
20 and Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste
21 Element for the County of Ventura.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

23 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We got a motion by Mr.
24 Medina, a second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

25 Substitute the previous roll?

1 On consent?

2 Thank you, members.

3 And now our last item, 59, AF, an update of the
4 Public Venues Waste Diversion Project.

5 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. Chris Schmidle
6 will give you an update on what's taking place.

7 MR. SCHMIDLE: Good morning, Committee members.

8 In July 2001 Board members indicated that they
9 would like an increase in efforts directed at waste
10 reduction and education programs for non-state venue
11 facilities such as stadiums, amusement parks, and museums;
12 and local special events such as food festivals and
13 cultural celebrations.

14 Since that time staff has been identifying and
15 developing needed tools and resources, coordinating
16 efforts with other divisions of the Board and other state
17 agencies, and organizing a network of local government and
18 venues and events industry peers. Direct assistance for
19 individual venues and events is limited by budget and
20 staffing constraints.

21 The Board previously heard progress reports on
22 this project in February and July of 2002. The following
23 is an update of the staff's activities and progress since
24 the last report.

25 In the area of internal and external coordination

1 staff has assisted the California Resource Recovery
2 Association in setting up a statewide technical committee
3 focusing specifically on waste reduction at large venues
4 and events.

5 We have presented or attended two special events
6 recycling workshops for local recycling coordinators and
7 venue event managers in San Francisco and San Mateo
8 counties.

9 Served as the Diversion, Planning and Local
10 Assistance Division representative on the WRAP of the Year
11 Awards Committee in order to research ways to assist in
12 marketing new WRAP awards to private sector venue
13 facilities.

14 Participated in a trial roll-out of the new waste
15 reduction program at the 49ers preseason football games at
16 Candlestick Park. The trial was a success, and the
17 regular season program is now in place.

18 Provided technical assistance to two different
19 consultants in designing large venue waste
20 characterization studies conducted last summer at four
21 different events.

22 And helped promote the Department of
23 Conservation, Division of Recycling Deposit Container
24 Recycling Grant Program. The focus of this year's grant
25 cycle is recycling away from home at public venues.

1 In the area of web-based education and assistance
2 staff is developing a venues and large events waste
3 reduction website to provide targeted education and
4 information to venues and events managers and staff,
5 jurisdiction recycling coordinators, and the general
6 public.

7 Over 35 pages of information and spreadsheets
8 have already been drafted and are now being processed by
9 the Information Management Branch.

10 Features of this website include links to
11 technical resources and assistance currently offered by
12 the Board, other state and local agencies, and private
13 industry; case studies of successful venue waste reduction
14 programs forms to assist venue and events staff to
15 estimate potential waste diversion costs and savings;
16 sample municipal ordinance and policy language requiring
17 waste reduction at venue facilities that jurisdictions can
18 use as templates in adopting their own mandates; and
19 sample facility reduction policies that venue managers can
20 include in their agreements with venues, concessionaires,
21 and contractors; and, finally, a sample waste analysis
22 data collection form based on the Board's standard waste
23 characterization method in a summary report format to
24 standardize study results from different sources so they
25 can be compared at a basic level.

1 As described above, staff has made significant
2 progress towards goals of this project.

3 Taking a look ahead, the next steps in the
4 project include assisting the venues in Special Events
5 Recycling Council of CRRA and setting program goals and
6 developing a network of stakeholders. This will include
7 participating in two venues and events waste reduction
8 workshops sponsored by the technical council; continuing
9 development of the Board's venues and events website with
10 a targeted date for roll-out to the public in the summer
11 of 2003; writing a step-by-step web-based guide to
12 developing a venues and events waste reduction plan with
13 industry-specific tips, recommendations and references;
14 identifying additional successful venue waste reduction
15 programs to profile as case studies; and networking with
16 representatives of major venue and event professional
17 associations to gain their cooperation and endorsement of
18 waste reduction programs. Staff will continue to bring
19 periodic updates to the Board as the project progresses.

20 And that is the end of my presentation. Do you
21 have any questions?

22 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Members, any questions?

23 Thank you very much.

24 MR. SCHMIDLE: Thank you for your support of the
25 project.

1 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah, keep banging. You're
2 doing good things.

3 All right. Now is our time at the end of a
4 meeting if anybody from the public has anything they would
5 like to say.

6 Seeing nobody.

7 I want to thank the staff, thank the members.

8 And happy holidays.

9 (Thereupon the California Integrated Waste
10 Management Board, Diversion, Planning and
11 Local Assistance Committee adjourned at
12 11:50 a.m.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2 I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand
3 Reporter of the State of California, and Registered
4 Professional Reporter, do hereby certify:

5 That I am a disinterested person herein; that the
6 foregoing California Integrated Waste Management Board,
7 Diversion, Planning and Local Assistance Committee meeting
8 was reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a
9 Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California,
10 and thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

11 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
12 attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any
13 way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
15 this 2nd day of January, 2003.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 JAMES F. PETERS, CSR, RPR
24 Certified Shorthand Reporter
25 License No. 10063